DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 041 CE 008 240

AUTHOR Kern, Richard P.
TITLE Analyses of WIN Team Functioning and Job Requirements, Final Report: Duties Performed and Style of Functioning, in Relation to Team Effectiveness. Technical Report 72-12.
INSTITUTION Human Resources Research Organization, Monterey, Calif. Div. 3.
SPONS AGENCY Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO HumRRO-TR-72-12
PUB DATE Apr 72
CONTRACT 51-49-70-03
NOTE 150p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Counseling Services; Counselor Role; Data Analysis; Employment Services; Group Relations; Interpersonal Competence; *Job Analysis; Personnel Evaluation; Personnel Management; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Staff Improvement; Staff Role; Staff Utilization; Tables (Data); Team Training; *Teamwork; Training Techniques; *Vocational Counseling; Vocational Development
IDENTIFIERS WIN; *Work Incentive Program

ABSTRACT

Data were collected from a total of 110 WIN (Work Incentive Programs) Employability Development Teams to obtain information regarding the staffing composition of WIN teams, the extent to which distribution of job effort among team members emphasizes duty area specialization by job position title, the style of functioning in making client-oriented decisions, and the extent to which these factors contribute to the teams' effectiveness in the accomplishment of team and client goals. Major findings and recommendations showed and suggested that: (1) The more effective teams are those that deemphasize the separation among job position specialties in distributing the teams' work activities; (2) guidelines for staffing of WIN teams should consider four basic job position specialties instead of the current five. (These four are coach, counselor, job developer, and the clerical position. The work-training specialist position was deleted.); (3) it is important that all team members receive team training as a necessary condition for its impact on team performance; and (4) teams located in areas of relatively low unemployment routinely refer enrollees considered not job-ready to WIN Orientation and use this period of enrollment to interact with them in developing employability goals and plans. (TA)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

HumRRO
Technical
Report
72-12

ED130041

Analyses of WIN Team Functioning and Job Requirements, Final Report

Duties Performed and Style of Functioning, in Relation to Team Effectiveness

Richard P. Kern

HumRRO Division No. 3
Monterey, California
HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

April 1972

CE 008 240

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research and development Contract No. 51-49-70-03 authorized by the Social Security Act. Since contractors performing such work under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely, the report does not necessarily represent the Department's official opinion or policy. Moreover, the contractor is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material developed in this report.

The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) is a nonprofit corporation established in 1969 to conduct research in the field of training and education. It is a continuation of The George Washington University Human Resources Research Office. HumRRO's general purpose is to improve human performance, particularly in organizational settings, through behavioral and social science research, development, and consultation.

Published
April 1972
by
HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	**1. Report No.** HumRRO-TR-72-12	**2.**	**3. Recipient's Accession No.**

4. Title and Subtitle
ANALYSES OF WIN TEAM FUNCTIONING AND JOB REQUIREMENTS, FINAL REPORT: Duties Performed and Style of Functioning, in Relation to Team Effectiveness

5. Report Date
Apr 72

6.

7. Author(s)
Richard P. Kern

8. Performing Organization Rept. No.
Technical Report 72-12

9. Performing Organization Name and Address
Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.

11. Contract/Grant No.
DL 51-49-70-03

12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address
U.S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration
Office of Research and Development
1111 20th St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20210

13. Type of Report & Period Covered
Final Report

14.

15. Supplementary Notes HumRRO Division No. 3, Monterey, California. WIN I-HumRRO Technical Report 71-19, Analyses of WIN Team Functioning and Job Requirements. Phase 1: Duties and Tasks Performed by Teams and Team Members, August 1971.

16. Abstracts

Data collected from WIN Employability Development Teams were used to describe team functioning in terms of two major variables: style of functioning in arriving at client-oriented decisions, and in extent to which distribution of job duty effort among team members emphasizes duty area specialization by job position title. Data were analyzed for relationships between team experience, training, and staffing characteristics and the two style of functioning variables; relationships between the two style of functioning variables and criteria of accomplishment of team communication and coordination objectives and criteria of accomplishment of program services and successful enrollee outcome. Recommendations are made regarding team staffing and in-service training based upon data presented in this report and the preceding Phase 1 report.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

*Counseling-vocational interests
*Employment
*Job analysis
*Manpower
*Personnel development
*Personnel management
*Programmed instruction

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

Effectiveness
Job Description
Rehabilitation
Social Welfare
Unemployment
Work Incentive Program
Employment Services
Manpower Development Programs

17c. COSATI Field/Group
0509 Behavioral and Social Sciences/Personnel Selection, Training, and Evaluation.
0510 Behavioral and Social Sciences/Psychology.

18. Availability Statement
Distribution is unlimited. Available from
National Technical Information Service,
Springfield, Va., 22151

19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED

20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED

21. No. of Pages
150

22. Price

SUMMARY

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The present study was designed to obtain information regarding the staffing composition of WIN teams; the work activities performed by the different manpower specialties represented on the teams; the ways in which teams utilize and coordinate the efforts of team members and client during employability planning and decision making; and the extent to which these factors contribute to the teams' effectiveness in the accomplishment of team and client goals.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Duties and Tasks Performed

Analysis of data collected on duties and tasks performed by WIN team members resulted in five job position descriptions. These descriptions emphasize specialties in major duty areas for each job position consistent with expectations based on the WIN team guidelines.

The coaches are identified with the major expenditure of effort in the duty area concerned with provision of supportive services and monitoring of enrollee progress, and to a lesser extent in record maintenance and procedures.

Counselors expend their greatest level of effort in tasks directly concerned with developing enrollees' employability goals, and a lesser but still distinctive level of effort in three other areas—supportive services and monitoring of enrollee progress; initial assignment of enrollees; and monitoring and provision of education, work, and training component resources.

Job developers expend their major effort in the area of job development and placement, and a secondary lower level of effort in monitoring and provision of education, work, and training components.

Work-training specialists appear more as generalists than do persons in the other positions and tend to distribute their effort more evenly over all duty areas; it is this relative lack of duty area identification that makes their job position profile distinctive.

Clerical members of the teams focus their time primarily in the two duty areas of record maintenance and procedures, and receipt and processing of referrals.

A major finding of this study has been that the more effective teams are those that deemphasize the separation among job position specialties in distributing the teams' work load and involve all team members in a broader range of the teams' work activities. Detailed job position descriptions based on these more effective teams are presented in the final chapter of this report.

Team Staffing Patterns

WIN team staffing recommended in the WIN Handbook consists of five job position specialties: coach, counselor, job developer, work-training specialist, and clerk-stenographer. Data in the present study were collected from a total of 110 teams distributed among 33 states. Teams staffed with the full five position staffing pattern constituted only 35% of these 110 teams. Order of priority when less than five positions were staffed starts with the counselor as the position almost always staffed; second priority is for the coach; third priority is essentially a "tie" between the job developer and the clerk; and finally, least frequently staffed is the work-training specialist position.

Results of the study indicate that guidelines for staffing of WIN teams should consider four basic job position specialties instead of the current five. These four are: coach, counselor, job developer, and the clerical position. The staff element deleted in this recommendation is the work-training specialist.

Two types of evidence support this staff deletion:

(1) The job position descriptions presented in this report (Chapter 4) indicated that the work-training specialist tends to serve as an apprentice or assistant to both the counselor and the job developer and, in addition, is frequently cast as the supervisor of the coach and clerk. Thus, the individual serving in this position has no particular caseload services or specialty identification.

(2) Teams staffed with the full five job positions show evidence of relatively high role disagreement among team members more often than do teams staffed with fewer than the five positions. The paygrade and experience hierarchy of the Employment Service, as it affects WIN team structure, appears to be, first, the counselor who is usually the team leader; next, job developer; third, work-training specialist; and coach and clerk approximately "tied" for the lowest pay and experience level positions.

It appears that when the team has all five positions staffed, the presence of the work-training specialist position, as it has been implemented, reduces the team's effectiveness. It should be made clear that it is not the incumbent with that job title who is the problem, it is the staffing structure considered within the context of the Employment Service. This position, as assistant to both the counselor and the job developer and as supervisor of the coach and clerk, has the effect of separating the team into status layers and minimizing the job duty communication and coordination interaction between the counselor and the job developer on the one hand, and the coach on the other hand. The coach's major duty responsibility of monitoring the enrollees' progress during enrollment make close communication between this person and the counselor and the job developer very important.

Team Member and Team Training

A major finding of this study concerns in-service team training and the conditions under which training has an impact on team performance. These data stress the importance of all team members' receiving team training as a necessary condition for its impact on team performance.

When these conditions are met, the training appears to provide a common frame of reference for team members that reduces confusion regarding the nature of each other's job role and provides an initial basis for the development of effective functioning. Additional major effects of team training vary depending on the length of time team members have worked together. Teams whose members have all received training exhibit a more thorough approach to employability planning and, particularly among the less experienced teams, the use of team conferences to accomplish planning and decision making. While the use of team conferences has generally been stressed very heavily in training, it was found in this study that the majority of teams using conferences are not able to use them effectively. This is attributed to a general failure to conduct team training beyond an initial "one-shot" session.

Currently, the most effective coordination of team member efforts and development of employability planning appears to come about as a combined result of team training and longer periods of team member experience in working together. Again, a necessary condition is that *all* of the team members have received the training. These teams appear to achieve their more effective functioning through informal working relationships. They tend to deemphasize job position specialties in distributing the team's workload and involve all team members in a broader range of the team's work activities. Their greater effectiveness is demonstrated not only in terms of better communication and coordination among team members but, also, in terms of higher rates of successful program outcome for their enrollees (ranging from 25 to 60% of program terminations).

The development of greater team effectiveness through the combination of team training for all team members and 15 months or more of subsequent experience in working together is encouraging to note. However, because of normal team member turnover and the general absence of follow-up training, not many teams are likely to develop effective performance by this formula. Our observations indicate that team training sessions were usually held when WIN projects were initiated, but that most states did not have the capability of continuing these efforts to meet either normal follow-up requirements or the problem of team member turnover. These observations also suggest that subsequent training conducted by state offices has generally been restricted to instruction on changes in administrative policies and forms.

Training of Employability Development teams represents a problem that extends beyond the WIN program. With the anticipation of the Family Assistance Program (FAP) and the extension of the team approach to other manpower programs, the response in some states has been to transfer key personnel from existing WIN teams to serve as cadre for on-the-job development of new teams. This degrades the effectiveness of the existing WIN teams and provides, at best, an inadequate approach to the training of new teams.

For further improvement of team effectiveness, it is recommended that a system be established for entry-level and follow-up training for team member job positions and teams as a unit. Present observations indicate that, in general, both individual job position and team training have had a very low priority.

The focus of team and team member training should be on skills and knowledges that the team can use to influence program outcome for its enrollees. Currently these skills and knowledges vary considerably from state to state because of differential restrictions placed on the degree of control the team can exercise over use of program resources. For example, there appears to be wide variation in the extent to which teams can actually identify and contract for training for individual enrollees. Teams that have little operational freedom in this regard have lost what is probably one of their most important tools for influencing program outcome for their enrollees.

Disregarding current variations among states, training that focuses on the teams' ability to influence program outcome should include training in the following: the obtaining and utilization of local labor market information; the obtaining and utilization of information regarding local training resources; the accomplishing of training contracts for individual enrollees; conduct and use of employability orientation training in working with the enrollee during development of employability goals; procedures for maintaining contact with the enrollee during training and the job entry follow-up period; and organization of the team's collective effort in a manner to support close communication and coordination among themselves, with the enrollee, and with the welfare representative.

Initial Assignment Practices

During data collection, it was learned that regardless of variations in content, teams that tended to use orientation routinely as initial assignment for the not-job-ready client emphasized its value in providing a period of time during which the team could interact with the enrollee and the enrollee could consider alternative goals before reaching a decision.

Data from the present study suggest that teams located in areas of relatively low unemployment routinely refer enrollees considered not-job-ready to WIN Orientation and use this period of enrollment to interact with them in developing employability goals and plans. Enrollees of these teams achieve relatively high rates of successful program terminations. In contrast, teams located in areas of relatively high unemployment do not routinely refer the not-job-ready to WIN Orientation and instead tend to make initial assignments directly to work or training components. Since this is generally done on the basis of one or two contacts with the enrollee this means that tentative employability plans and goals have been identified with very little interaction between the enrollee and the team. Enrollees of these teams have relatively low rates of successful program completion (fewer than 25% of all terminations).

Conclusions drawn from these data have to be approached with caution; there is a modest relationship between successful termination rates and unemployment rates for the corresponding labor areas. However, if it is generally true that teams in areas of relatively high unemployment "skip over" the effort of working out employability plans with their enrollees, it seems unlikely that the assignments made to work and training components would lead to job placements. Thus, these findings raise a question regarding the extent to which the lower rates of program success in areas of high unemployment are simply due to lack of available jobs, or are due to lack of team effort in working with enrollees to develop acceptable employability plans. Further study would be required to develop specific implications of these findings for program design and management.

CONTENTS

Chapter Page

1 Introduction 3
- Background 3
- Objectives 4
- Organization of the Study 4
- The WIN Team Staffing Concept 5
  - Team Composition 5
  - Staffing Ratio 6
- Implementation of the Team Staffing Concept 6
  - Data Base of Present Study 6
  - Summary of Team Staffing Pattern Findings 7

2 Description and Analyses of WIN Team Functioning 11
- Organization of the Analyses 11
- Team Decision-Making and Division of Labor 11
  - Assessing Team Style of Functioning in Decision-Making 11
    - Interview Scoring Categories 12
    - Use of Interview Analysis to Describe Team Style 14
  - Assessing Team Style of Functioning in Division of Labor 15
- Indices of Accomplishment of Team Objectives 17
  - Assessing Characteristics of Team-Member Interaction 17
    - Clarity of Role Communication 17
    - Relative Importance of Team Members and Client in Decision-Making 19
    - Monthly Caseload Status Reports 21
- Office, Team, and Team-Member Characteristics 23

3 Data Analyses and Presentation of Findings 25
- Overview 25
- Relationship of Office and Team Characteristics to Team Style of Functioning 34
  - Two Styles of Functioning Variables 34
  - Findings 35
    - Style of Decision Functioning 35
    - Style of Functioning in Terms of Job Position Specialization 38
    - Relationship Between Style of Decision Functioning and Job Position Specialization 38
  - Summary: Team Characteristics and Style of Functioning 40
- Relationship of Style of Functioning to Accomplishment of Team Objectives 41

Page

Chapter

3 (Cont.)
    Indices of Team Interaction as Criteria of Accomplishment of Team Objectives ... 41
    Findings on Team Interaction as a Criterion ... 42
        Style of Decision Functioning and Accomplishment of Team Interaction Objectives ... 42
        Style of Functioning in Division of Labor and Accomplishment of Team Interaction Objectives ... 44
    Summary: Style of Functioning and Accomplishment of Team Interaction Objectives ... 45
    Monthly Caseload Status Reports as Criteria of Accomplishment of Team Objectives ... 46
    Findings on Delivery of Service as a Criterion ... 46
        Style of Decision Functioning and Accomplishment of Caseload Services ... 46
        Style of Division of Labor and Accomplishment of Program Services ... 50
        Summary: Style of Functioning and Accomplishment of Caseload Services ... 52
  Supplementary Analyses ... 53
    Relationship of Team Experience, Training, and Staffing to Team Interaction ... 54
    Relationship of Team Characteristics to Accomplishment of Caseload Services ... 57
    Relationship of Team Interaction to Accomplishment of Caseload Services ... 57

4 **Summary and Recommendations** ... 67
  Scope of the Study ... 67
  Types of WIN Offices ... 67
  Job Position Descriptions ... 68
  Team Staffing Patterns and Staffing Recommendations ... 81
  Team Members and Team Training ... 82
  Initial Assignment Practices ... 83

Literature Cited ... 87

Appendices
A Study Design and Procedures ... 89
B Advance Questionnaire for On-Site Data Collection ... 106
C Interviewer Outline and Data Forms for the WIN Supervisor Interview ... 115
D Interviewer Outline for the Team Leader or Senior Team Member Interview ... 120
E Work Activities Inventory ... 122

Page

Tables

1-1 Team Staffing Patterns—Site Visit Sample 8
1-2 Team Staffing Patterns—Mail Sample 9
1-3 Relative Frequency Team Member Job Positions When Full WIN Team Staff is Not Used 10
2-1 Distribution of Teams on Each of the Four Decision-Interview Scoring Categories . . 13
2-2 Revised Description of Major Duty Areas From Job Activities Inventory (JAI) 16
2-3 Illustration and Computation of JAI Duty Area Scores and Indices of Job Position Specialization for a Five-Member Team 16
2-4 Subcategorization of the Average Monthly Caseload Volume 22
3-1 Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample 26
3-2 Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Team Style of Functioning Variables: Site-Visit Sample 27
3-3 Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Indices of Accomplishment of Team Objectives: Site-Visit Sample 28
3-4 Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Mail Sample 31
3-5 Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Team Style of Functioning Variables: Mail Sample 32
3-6 Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Indices of Accomplishment of Team Objectives: Mail Sample 32
3-7 Illustration of Data Analyses Used in this Report—Basic 2 x 2 Contingency Tables . . 33
3-8 Illustration of Form of Data Presentation Used in This Report—Percentage of Teams With High and Low Style of Decision Functioning Scores That Were in the Category for Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample 34
3-9 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Decision Functioning Scores That Were in the High Category for Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample 36
3-10 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Decision Timing Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample 36
3-11 Percentage of Teams With and Without Initial Assignment Alternatives That Were in the High Category for Team Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample 37
3-12 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Member Contact Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample 37

Tables (Cont.)

Page

3-13 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Conference Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample 38

3-14 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in the High Category for Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample 39

3-15 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in the High Category for Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Mail Sample 39

3-16 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in the High Category for Decision Functioning Scores: Site-Visit Sample 40

3-17 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Decision Functioning Scores That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 42

3-18 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Decision Timing Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 43

3-19 Percentage of Teams With and Without Initial Assignment Alternatives That Were in the High Category for Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 43

3-20 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Member Contact Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 44

3-21 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Conference Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 44

3-22 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 45

3-23 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Style of Decision Functioning Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 47

3-24 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Decision Timing Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 47

3-25 Percentage of Teams With and Without Initial Assignment Alternatives That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 48

3-26 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Member Contact Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 48

3-27 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Conference Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 49

3-28 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 51

3-29 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample 52

Page

Tables (Cont.)

3-30 Percentage of Teams From Offices With High and Low Duration of WIN Experience That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 54

3-31 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Average Team Member Experience That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 54

3-32 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Experienced Team Leaders That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site Visit Sample 55

3-33 Percentage of Teams Having High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Prior Employment Service Experience That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 55

3-34 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Inservice Team Training That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 56

3-35 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Staffing Pattern That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 56

3-36 Percentage of Teams Staffed With High and Low Number of Team Members That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample 56

3-37 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Office Experience That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 57

3-38 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Average Team Member Experience That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 58

3-39 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Experienced Team Leaders That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 58

3-40 Percentage of Teams Having High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Prior Employment Service Experience That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 59

3-41 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Inservice Team Training That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 59

3-42 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Staffing Pattern That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 60

3-43 Percentage of Teams Staffed With High and Low Number of Team Members That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 60

3-44 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Average Team Member Experience That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample 61

3-45 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Experienced Team Leaders That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample 61

3-46 Percentage of Teams Having High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Prior Employment Service Experience That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample 62

Page

Tables (Cont.)

3-47 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Inservice Team Training That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample 62

3-48 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Staffing Pattern That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample 63

3-49 Percentage of Teams Staffed With High and Low Number of Team Members That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample 63

3-50 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Summary % Agreement Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 64

3-51 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Summary % Disagreement Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 64

3-52 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Summary % Ambiguity Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 65

3-53 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Spread of Team Decision Making Importance Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 65

3-54 Percentage of Teams With High and Low Client Decision-Making Importance Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample 66

4-1 Distribution of Relative Time Estimate Means Over Duty Areas for Each Job Position 69

4-2 Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions 70

A-1 Final Sampling Categories: Distribution of Team Locations, by Category, in the Final Pool of 43 States 91

A-2 Office-Type Locations Where Data Were Collected On-Site 92

A-3 Resume of States Participating in the Mail-Questionnaire Sample in Relation to Initial Pool 94

A-4 Office-Type Locations That Received Mail Questionnaires, and Status of Returns 95

A-5 State Office Locations Used From Pool of 43 States for Site-Visit and Mail Samples 97

A-6 Interview Analysis—Indexes of Scorer Agreement 100

A-7 Score Weights Used in Scoring the Four Components of the Style of Decision Functioning (DF) Score 102

Analyses of WIN Team Functioning and Job Requirements, Final Report

Duties Performed and Style of Functioning, in Relation to Team Effectiveness

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The Work Incentive Program (WIN) was established on the basis of amendments made in 1967 to the Social Security Act, under Part C, Title IV. The objectives of WIN are to provide the necessary services and opportunities to enable potentially employable recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) to gain economic independence for themselves and their families. To this end, the WIN program was designed to make available, on an individual basis, vocational planning, education, training, and job-placement services, while at the same time providing social supportive services necessary to enable the welfare recipient to participate.

The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) share administrative responsibility for the WIN program. The United States Training Employment Service (USTES) is the agency within DOL that is responsible for developing and administering the program. WIN is sponsored and administered at the state level by the state Employment Service and is staffed and conducted at the community level by the local Employment Services office.

WIN has been described as an outgrowth of "earlier efforts to introduce the concept of occupational rehabilitation as a solution to the problems of welfare recipients" (1). Experience gained from the Community Work and Training Program and the subsequent Work Experience and Training Program, as well as other regular manpower programs, is cited as having led government planners to the view that these earlier efforts were not able to provide the scope of social and manpower services necessary to effectively assist the welfare recipient.

The WIN program envisions making available a full range of employability development services, including vocational planning and counseling; education; job training in an institutional or work-experience setting; job placement; and post-placement follow-up. Concurrent with these services, the program would provide the supportive social services necessary to enable the welfare recipient to participate and develop his vocational skills. These services would include, in addition to continued welfare services and assistance payments, a WIN incentive payment during training, reimbursement for transportation, special training expenses and child care, and assistance in dealing with problems that might develop and interfere with the enrollee's continued participation in the program.

In addition to a broader scope of services than in earlier efforts, a distinctive feature of the WIN program design is its emphasis upon individualizing the process of employability development from the time the enrollee enters the program to 90-180 days after his job placement. The welfare recipient referred to WIN is assisted by an Employability Development team, with whom he will work throughout the full period of employability development.

The team will generally consist of a counselor, training specialist, job developer, job coach, and a clerk. These individuals are expected to bring together skills and knowledges regarding: personal and vocational counseling; community resources for assistance in dealing with health, legal, and other personal or family problems; training opportunities and requirements for development of specific occupational goals; relevance of the various goals to labor market opportunities; location of particular job opportunities in the local labor market; and the WIN program regulations, including how to use them to accomplish client objectives.

The team is expected to integrate these skills and knowledges and use them to assist the client in developing and accomplishing employability goals relevant to the regular labor market and to the client's needs and desires. In addition to the team's role in employability planning, and providing appropriate training and job placement opportunities, the team is expected to maintain contact with the enrollee to provide supportive assistance, as needed, to deal with problems that might affect program participation.

The enrollment of AFDC recipients in WIN began in October 1968. By July 1969, 38 states and the Trust Territories were participating and the enrollment was 62,000 (2); one year later, in July 1970, when information regarding office location and staffing was solicited for this study, WIN programs had been funded in all but one state (3) and the enrollment had risen to approximately 90,000 (4).

As implementation efforts have progressed, DOL has initiated studies to identify problems in the various subsystems of the WIN program model and to relate them to changes needed in program guidelines and/or the enabling legislation. Because of the recency of initiation of the program and the studies, final reports are currently available from only a few of these studies (5, 6, 7, 8, 9). While the immediate concern is improvement of the WIN program, it appears that there is also major concern with the identification and further development of program concepts important to the planning and operation of manpower programs under different types of legislative and administrative policies envisioned for the near future.

Since implementation of the WIN program, the concept of teams (referred to as Employability Development teams) has been extended to the staffing of other DOL manpower programs. The type of staffing required to provide clients effective and efficient delivery of services at the local level is of concern to those administering the present program as well as to those developing policy and legislative requirements for future programs. The present study was undertaken to provide a detailed, systematic analysis of team and team member functioning in relation to the WIN team concept and to relate these findings to recommendations for current WIN program operations as well as their implications for staffing concepts in future manpower programs.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the full study were to:

(1) Analyze and describe how the WIN staffs function in the team context.

(2) Analyze and describe how decisions are made with respect to the individual enrollee.

(3) Make recommendations, from these analyses, for the further development and articulation of the WIN team concept—including team-member job descriptions, job entry level knowledge and skill requirements, training objective outlines for in-service team training, and potential criteria for future use in evaluating team effectiveness.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Work was divided into two successive phases, because of the scope of the data collection and analyses required to meet the final objectives.

Phase 1 included the development of instruments and collection of data from two samples of WIN teams. One sample required site visits for data collection; the second sample relied upon questionnaires that were mailed to selected teams. A report resulted from this phase, describing team staffing patterns; levels of experience, education, and retraining; and job activities performed by the staffs of 51 WIN teams from whom data were obtained during on-site visits (10).

Phase 2, described in this report, focused on analyses of WIN team functioning based upon five groups or classes of variables:

Group 1: Team staffing, training, and experience variables.
Group 2: Team style of functioning in client-oriented decision making.
Group 3: Team style of functioning in terms of job-position specialization.
Group 4: Team interaction variables (i.e., role communication and spread of decision-making importance among team members and client), as criteria of effectiveness of style of functioning.
Group 5: Indices of team accomplishment of caseload functions based on monthly caseload status reports.

With the Phase 1 analyses as background, this report presents analyses, based upon the preceding variables, that form the data base for the conclusions and recommendations presented in this report.

THE WIN TEAM STAFFING CONCEPT

TEAM COMPOSITION

WIN guidelines described a basic staffing pattern for the team, consisting of one counselor, one job developer, one work and training specialist, one coach, and one clerk-stenographer.

In addition, local offices were urged to establish one to three pre-professional aide slots. These were to be on-the-job (OJT) training slots to be filled by enrollees who would be trained to assist the coach in establishing rapport and maintaining contact with the other enrollees. Since these positions are not part of the regular staffing pattern, they will not be considered in the present discussion.

The major duties described in the WIN Handbook (11) for each of the five basic team member positions are summarized as follows:

Counselor. Counselors are expected to provide the full array of professional, vocational, and personal counseling services; to establish realistic employability plans for individual enrollees utilizing test results and other data available; and to act as coordinator and integrator of all team services provided.

Job Developer. This position was originally listed as "manpower specialist," but is now more commonly referred to as "job developer." The person in this position is expected to work with the counselor as well as the outside employer and training agencies for the purpose of identifying and developing training situations needed to implement the employability plans of individual enrollees; to supervise and monitor these training situations to ensure that they meet program standards; and to provide job development and placement services, or, if these services are provided by the Employment Services (ES) regular staff, to coordinate these services for the team's enrollees.

Work and Training Specialist. This person is to act as an expeditor of all services needed by enrollees, and is to see that needed services are actually provided. He is responsible for development of group activities dealing with work orientation subjects, such as how to get and hold a job; he assists the counselor by assisting enrollees with problems that do not require referral to the counselor; he works with the job developer by serving as job development and placement coordinator for a portion of the team's caseload.

Coach. This position is described as a pre-professional position. This person is expected to provide continuity to the relationship between the team and the individual enrollee during his enrollment. The coach is expected to be the team member to whom the enrollee directly relates and the one the enrollee identifies as his immediate contact in the event of problems. The coach maintains follow-up contacts with the enrollee and the enrollee's supervisor throughout training; he assists the enrollee in resolving minor problems that may arise and refers more difficult ones to the work and training specialist or the counselor; he is expected to conduct sessions dealing with areas such as interpersonal relations, grooming, or money management, and participates in group counseling sessions.

Clerk-Stenographer. The WIN Handbook does not describe the duties of the clerk-stenographer. It assumes that the individual in this position is expected to provide general administrative and clerical assistance.

These general duty descriptions suggest that the counselor, job developer, and coach are each expected to represent a different area of competency in the delivery of manpower services. The work and training specialist is apparently expected to have at least an assistant's level of competency in both the counselor's and the job developer's areas, in addition to his role as a general expeditor of all services. These brief duty descriptions also provide a general idea of the major functions the team is expected to accomplish.

As the guidelines note, in some localities it may not be practical to have the team provide all WIN services to its clients. For example, job development services for the team's enrollees may be provided by the regular Employment Service staff or contracted to another manpower agency in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.

STAFFING RATIO

Team staffing under the WIN team concept is also influenced by the number of enrollee slots authorized for a particular office location. The five team-member positions, staffed at one person per position, represent the basic staffing pattern for the WIN team. The WIN Handbook recommended an upper caseload limit of 200 enrollees for this team. This figure assumed that if a team had a full caseload of 200, the enrollees would be distributed over different phases of the program in such a way that the counselor's active caseload during any one period would not exceed 50 enrollees.

This review of the staffing pattern and staffing ratio aspects of the team concept suggests that the WIN team was not designed as a "package" staffing concept to be implemented in an "all-or-none" fashion. It is perhaps better described as a modular concept, from which staffing positions can be selected and implemented to provide program services to WIN enrollees that could otherwise not be provided through arrangements with either on-going Employment Service or related programs. Thus, if, as in the earlier example, a local ES office had access to on-going job development services, WIN team staffing would not necessarily include a person in the job-developer position.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TEAM STAFFING CONCEPT

DATA BASE OF PRESENT STUDY

This discussion summarizes major aspects of the sample selection made in this study. Detailed descriptions of procedures followed in selecting these samples, collection of the data, and the interviews and questionnaires used are presented in Appendix A.

The sampling pool consisted of 43 states within the contiguous continental United States. Prior to selecting the states to be represented in the site-visit and mail samples, WIN team office locations within these states were classified into five office-type categories. These categories were based upon two control factors: number of teams operating at a particular physical location, and size of the population in the surrounding community. The five office-type categories are:

Office Type I: Single-team offices; rural or small urban community.[1]
Office Type II: Single-team offices; small SMSA community.[2]
Office Type III: Single-team offices; large SMSA community.[3]
Office Type IV: Two-to-three-team offices; large SMSA community.
Office Type V: Four-or-more-team offices; large SMSA community.

The site-visit sample was selected with the restrictions that only one team would participate from any one office and that only one office location of a particular office type could be selected within each state. Thus, if a state had office locations classified in each of the five office-type categories, a maximum of five office locations (or five teams), one from each category, could be identified for site-visit data collection. The same restrictions were imposed during selection of the mail-questionnaire sample with the additional restriction that specific office locations identified for the site-visit sample were not eligible for inclusion in the mail-questionnaire sample. The 51 teams of the site-visit sample were drawn from a total of 17 states. The 59 teams comprising the final mail-questionnaire sample were drawn from a total of 33 states.

SUMMARY OF TEAM STAFFING PATTERN FINDINGS

Information about team composition or staffing pattern was obtained from the WIN office supervisor for the 51 teams in the site-visit sample and the 59 teams in the final mail-questionnaire sample. A copy of the Advance Questionnaire sent to WIN office supervisors for the site-visit sample is presented in Appendix B, and the outline and data forms for the interview are in Appendix C. Detailed information regarding team staffing among the 51 teams of the site-visit sample was presented in the Phase 1 report of this study (11). The present discussion will focus on the extent to which the five-position pattern of the WIN team staffing concept was found to exist among the teams in these two samples and on the identification of variations to the pattern.

Team supervisors were not included in these staffing patterns unless they also carried out caseload service functions associated with one of the team-member positions, in which case they were classified under the given job-position title. Specialized service staff who represent extra-team resources and are not considered members of any particular team are also not reflected in these staffing patterns.

The 15 staffing patterns represented among the 51 teams studied during site visits are shown in Table 1-1. These patterns range from a six-job position pattern to one based on two job positions. The WIN guidelines five-position pattern (coach, counselor, job developer, work-training specialist, and clerk-stenographer) occurred most frequently, although it was found in only 23 (45%) of the 51 teams.

The staffing pattern data organized correspondingly for the 59 teams from which data were obtained by mail questionnaire are presented in Table 1-2. Overall diversity of

---

[1] Rural to small urban: city of under 50,000 not included in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA).

[2] Small SMSA: under 250,000.

[3] Large SMSA: over 250,000.

Table 1-1

Team Staffing Patterns: Site-Visit Sample

Pattern Type	Team Member Job Positions						Number of Teams With Staffing Pattern, by Office Type					
	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerk-Stenographer	Orientation Specialist	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
6-Position												
6.0	x	x	x	x	x	x	1	0	0	2	0	3
5-Position												
5.0	x	x	x	x	x		3	5	5	5	2	20
5.1	x	x	x	x		x	0	1	0	0	0	1
5.2	x	x	x		x	x	0	1	1	0	1	3
4-Position												
4.0	x	x	x	x			0	0	1	0	1	2
4.1	x	x	x			x	1	1	0	0	0	2
4.2		x		x	x	x	1	0	0	0	0	1
4.3	x	x	x		x		1	0	2	1	2	6
4.4	x	x		x	x		1	2	0	2	1	6
3-Position												
3.0	x	x	x				0	0	1	0	0	1
3.1			x	x	x		1	0	0	0	0	1
3.2	x	x		x			0	1	0	0	0	1
3.3		x	x	x			0	0	1	0	1	2
2-Position												
2.0		x	x				1	0	0	0	0	1
2.1	x	x					0	0	0	0	1	1
Total Teams	46	50	42	37	40	10	10	11	11	10	9	51
Total Patterns	11	14	11	9	7	5	8	6	6	4	7	15

staffing patterns is comparable to that noted in the site-visit sample. Eighteen different staffing patterns are represented among these 59 teams, ranging from the six-position pattern to a one-position team. In terms of the most frequently occurring patterns, the mail-sample teams reflect two modal patterns. The WIN guidelines five-position pattern is included in 25% (15) of these teams; in addition, another 25% are staffed for four of the five positions, excluding the work-training specialist position.

What priority in job-position staffing occurs when staffing is for less than the basic five positions? Those teams with staffing patterns that failed to include all five of the basic team member job positions are presented in Table 1-3, in which the number of these teams containing a given job position is expressed as a percentage of the total number of the "incomplete" teams. This table suggests that when fewer than the five team-guideline positions are staffed, the counselor's position is almost always filled, with the remaining positions, listed in descending order of frequency, being coach, job developer, and clerical (or vice versa), and least frequently, work-training specialist.

Table 1-2

Team Staffing Patterns: Mail Sample

Pattern Type	Team Member Job Positions						Number of Teams With Staffing Pattern, by Office Types					
	Coach	Counselor	Job Devel-oper	Work-Training Specialist	Clerk-Steno-grapher	Orien-tation Specialist	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
6-Position												
6.0	x	x	x	x	x	x	0	1	0	1	0	2
5-Position												
5.0	x	x	x	x	x		0	4	6	2	1	13
5.1	x	x	x	x		x	0	1	1	0	1	3
5.2	x	x	x		x	x	1	1	1	0	0	3
5.3	x	x		x	x	x	1	1	0	0	0	2
4-Position												
4.0												
4.1												
4.2		x		x	x	x	1	0	0	0	0	1
4.3	x	x	x		x		3	2	3	5	2	15
4.4	x	x		x	x		3	2	0	0	0	5
4.5		x	x	x	x		0	1	0	0	0	1
3-Position												
3.0	x	x	x				0	0	1	0	0	1
3.1												
3.2	x	x		x			0	1	0	2	0	3
3.3		x	x	x			0	0	0	1	0	1
3.4	x		x	x			0	0	1	0	0	1
3.5		x	x			x	0	1	0	0	0	1
3.6		x		x	x		2	0	0	0	0	2
2-Position												
2.0												
2.1	x	x					1	1	0	0	0	2
2.2		x		x			1	1	0	0	0	2
1-Position												
1.0		x					0	0	1	0	0	1
Total Teams	50	58	41	36	44	12	13	17	14	11	4	59
Total Patterns	11	17	10	12	9	6	8	12	7	5	3	18

The great diversity of staffing patterns shown in Tables 1-1 and 1-2 suggests that state sponsors either do not perceive the five-position WIN staffing concept as critical to program effectiveness, or have found it impractical to implement for manpower or fiscal reasons.

Table 1-3

Relative Frequency of Team Member Job Positions When Full WIN Team Staff Is Not Used

(Percent)

Sample	Team Member Job Position				
	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerk-Stenographer
Site-Visit	82	96	68	50	61
Mail	80	98	59	48	66

Data collected on the job activities performed by the various team-member job positions resulted in five job-position profiles, with each emphasizing job duty specialties that are, in general, consistent with expectations based upon the WIN staffing concept. The findings regarding diversity of staffing patterns, coupled with these findings, emphasize the importance of focusing on the team as an operating unit if information of value is to be developed regarding factors affecting the team's accomplishment of their goals.

Chapter 2

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSES OF WIN TEAM FUNCTIONING

ORGANIZATION OF THE ANALYSES

The variables used and the approach taken to organize the analyses of WIN team functioning into three parts are discussed in this chapter. The analyses are presented in Chapter 3.

Part I of the analyses focuses on team style of functioning in decision making and on the manner in which caseload efforts are distributed among the various members of the team (i.e., extent of job position specialization).

Analyses focusing on these two aspects of team functioning will be carried out from two perspectives. First, we will study the impact of team staffing, training, and experience variables on style of decision making and division of labor in providing caseload services. Second, we will explore the relationship between these two style-of-functioning factors and two types of outcome criteria: (a) indices on the nature of team-member interaction in duty performance and decision making; (b) indices of accomplishment in providing caseload services, based upon monthly caseload status reports.

The analyses are directed to two questions: Are there certain types of conditions associated with the office, team, or team members that appear to be necessary for the teams' development of certain styles of functioning? Are certain styles of functioning associated with more effective accomplishment of team objectives?

Part II of the analyses will focus on office, team, and team-member characteristics and their relationships to indices of accomplishment of team objectives. The basic question addressed is: Are there certain types of conditions associated with the office, team, or team members which, by themselves, appear to have an important influence on accomplishing team objectives?

Part III of the analyses explores the relationship between indices of team accomplishment in team-member interaction (nature of team interaction in duty performance and decision making) and indices of accomplishment in the provision of caseload services (based upon caseload status reports). The major question is: Does the extent to which clarity of role communication is achieved among team members, or the extent to which team members and the client are involved in decision making, have an impact on services accomplished?

TEAM DECISION-MAKING AND DIVISION OF LABOR

ASSESSING TEAM STYLE OF FUNCTIONING IN DECISION-MAKING

Information describing the team's style of functioning in decision making was obtained from a semistructured interview conducted with the team leader or the team member who had served longest in that team. Thus, these data are available only for the site-visit sample. The objective of this interview was to trace, sequentially, contacts between the client and the WIN staff through the entire enrollment period.

The enrollment period was divided into three sequential phases: Period 1, from time of referral by Welfare to time the enrollee starts initial assignment; Period 2, from start of initial assignment to start in first education, work, or job-skill training component; Period 3, from start in first education or training component to eventual job placement.

The interview began with the first face-to-face contact between the WIN office and the client and elicited the following information regarding this and each succeeding contact:

(1) Job position identity of WIN staff members making the contact.
(2) Purpose of the contact.
(3) Whether particular contact was routine for all clients, or whether nature and type of contact depended upon client's individual circumstances or characteristics.
(4) Nature of decisions, if any, made on basis of the contact; who makes them; how; what courses of action result.
(5) Whether next contact was always the same, regardless of results of this contact; if not, description of the alternatives and basis used for selection among them.

A copy of the interviewer outline is contained in Appendix D. These interviews were reviewed and scored independently by two senior members of the research staff. A detailed description of the scoring and reliability of the scoring categories is contained in Appendix A.

Information from the interviews provided a basis for identifying events relevant to three major client decision points—enrollment, initial assignment, and identification of employability plan goals. Four characteristics of teams' style of functioning were identified and scored in reference to three decision points, as illustrated in Table 2-1. The four characteristics are as follows:

(1) Time-phasing of decision points—the three decisions, made separately or conjointly in time.
(2) Alternative decisions and courses of action utilized at enrollment and initial assignment for the not-job-ready.
(3) Number of team members having decision-related contact with the client or enrollee prior to making the decision.
(4) Team style of interaction in accomplishing the decision.

Interview Scoring Categories

(1) *Time-phasing of decision points—the three decisions made separately or conjointly in time.*

The number of teams scored as falling in each of the four possible time-phasing categories is shown in Table 2-1. Data from 50 site-visit teams are included; interview data from one team were not scorable.

For some teams the normal procedure, after completion of enrollment, was to schedule the client to return later for interviewing or testing before initial assignment decision; initial assignment might then be WIN Orientation, during which additional information would be collected and reviewed prior to a decision on employability plan goals that would be acted upon. This illustrates time-phasing of decision points with all three at separate points in time. For eight of the 50 teams, normal procedure was to make these decisions at separate points in time.

Some teams normally accomplished enrollment and initial assignment decisions conjointly, and then after some time lapse made decisions regarding the enrollee's employability plan goals. Twenty-three of the 50 site-visit teams performed in this fashion, while 12 allowed a period of time to elapse after the enrollment decision and then made initial assignment and employability plan goal decisions conjointly in time.

Table 2-1

Distribution of Teams on Each of the Four Decision-Interview Scoring Categories

Time Phasing of Decision Points	N	Decision Alternatives				Decision-Related Contacts		Form of Interaction	
		Enrollment		Initial Assignment		Multiple	Single	Conference	No Conference
		Yes	No	Yes	No				
All three separate	8	7	1	4	4				
Enrollment						1	7	1	7
Initial Assignment						2	6	2	6
Employability Plan						8	0	5	3
Two conjointly with Employability Plan separate	23	15	8	7	16				
Enrollment and Initial Assignment						18	5	9	14
Employability Plan						21	2	15	8
Two conjointly with Enrollment separate	12	6	6	11	1				
Enrollment						2	10	1	11
Initial Assignment and Employability Plan						3	9	6	6
All three decisions conjointly	7	5	2	4	3	1	6	0	7

Finally, there were seven teams with interview material indicating that enrollment, initial assignment, and employability plan goal decisions were all made at the same time.

(2) *Alternative decisions and courses of action utilized at enrollment and initial assignment for the not-job-ready.*

This category described whether the team ever returned referrals to Welfare as "inappropriate" prior to enrollment, and whether enrollees who were considered not-job-ready were routinely (or almost always) given initial assignment to Orientation. Approximately two-thirds of the teams (Table 2-1) exercised some option at enrollment, while initial assignment options for the not-job-ready were virtually nonexistent for approximately one-half the teams.

(3) *Number of team members having decision-related contact with client or enrollee prior to making the decision.*

Interview material describing client-team member contacts between successive decision points was analyzed for number of such contacts with different team members. This was not an attempt to estimate the actual number of contacts a team might normally have with the client. Rather, the intent was to assess the extent to which the team's normal operating procedure involved different team members, in contrast to only one team member having contact with the client just before each type of decision.

For example, in the case of the enrollment decision, a common procedure is for the team member conducting the enrollment interview to be the first to see the client; based upon the information obtained, this team member decides during the interview whether enrollment can be completed, and, if so, completes it at that time. Thus, only one team member has seen the client prior to the decision.

In some teams, this cycle is repeated for the initial assignment decision; the team member having completed the client's enrollment, may schedule the client to return to see the counselor. During this interview, the client and the counselor decide on the client's initial assignment. This is again scored as only one team member (the counselor) having a decision-related contact with the client prior to the initial assignment decision. This is not to discount the value of the enrollment information to the initial assignment decision; it is, rather, to contrast this team's procedure with another team's procedure in which, after enrollment, the client is scheduled to see the coach, job developer, and counselor before initial assignment decisions are made. Scoring for each decision point was simply multiple vs. single contact. Number of teams utilizing multiple or single contacts in relation to each decision point is shown in Table 2-1.

(4) *Team style of interaction in accomplishing the decision.*

This scoring category refers to the formal aspects of how the team normally proceeds in accomplishing decisions—that is, by individual decision-making, or by the team in a conference. The number of teams using conferences vs. the number in which decisions were made by a single individual is presented in Table 2-1. Use of team conferences is generally more frequent in connection with employability plan decisions, particularly among teams with time-phasing of decision points that makes employability plan decisions separate in time from the other decision points.

Use of Interview Analysis to Describe Team Style

The scoring categories provided basic information regarding attributes of the teams' style of decision-functioning. For use in the present analyses, these attributes were to be tied together for each team to reflect differences in style or pattern of functioning during the full employability planning process.

To accomplish this, two widely contrasting styles of team functioning were described. These are heuristic models or reference descriptions, intended to serve as opposing ends of a continuum denoting closeness of team-member interaction and communication in decision functioning. They provide a basis for making explicit premises about the relative importance of style of functioning to the more general performance objectives of the team. These two contrasting descriptions may be termed the "team-process" model and the "specialist-process" model.

The "team-process" model minimizes the specialist's sole dominance in decision-making. It maximizes contacts between all team members and the enrollee during each step in the process of developing enrollee employability plans and goals. The team then attempts to bring the information, thoughts, and opinions of all team members into interaction during team conferences to produce decisions regarding the employability development plans that the team perceives as appropriate to the particular enrollee and to the team's support capability. Thus, major characteristics of this team-process model are the emphasis upon contacts between enrollee and all team members and upon resultant interaction among team members as a basis for accomplishing the team's role in client-oriented decision-making.

The "specialist-process" model emphasizes the competence and wisdom of the specialist's decision-making during each step of employability plan and goal development. As a result, there is no need for team decision-making conferences. Coordination and communication carried out by the specialist is for the purpose of informing another specialist (e.g., a specialist responsible for providing certain services) that a particular client is to receive these services. As suggested in this example, the team may have either several specialists, each dealing with different functions independently and referring the enrollee from one to another for the different functions or services, or one central decision-making specialist, with the other team members acting as specialized providers of services, each dealing with a restricted area of functions or services.

The two models were viewed as opposing ends of a continuum concerned with the nature and extent of decision-making communication and coordination among team members. The team-process model at one extreme describes team members practicing a closely integrated style of decision-making; the specialist-process model at the other extreme describes decision-making centered upon the individual specialist with no decision-making communication or coordination among team members. Weights were assigned to the four decision-style attributes (interview scoring categories were described earlier) so as to give the highest numerical score to teams that displayed the greatest number of attributes most closely aligned to the team-process end of the continuum. (Premises used in deciding on relative weighting within each of the four categories obtained from the original scoring of the interviews are presented in Appendix A.) The result was a weighted score for each of the four decision-style attributes, and, by adding these four scores for a given team, a total style of decision-functioning (DF) score. Both the total score and the four component scores are used in the present analyses.

ASSESSING TEAM STYLE OF FUNCTIONING IN DIVISION OF LABOR

The Job Activities Inventory (JAI) was developed from a detailed screening of the WIN Handbook. Responses of the site-visit sample of teams to the JAI formed the basis of the previous report describing duties and tasks performed by WIN teams and team members. (A description of the development of this instrument and of the basic scoring procedures is contained in Appendix A; a copy of the inventory appears as the second section of the Work Activities Inventory booklet, Appendix E.)

The JAI consists of 82 task statements describing work activities some member or members of the team would be expected to perform in the course of providing program services to the team's enrollees. These tasks, as originally described in the Phase 1 report (10), were organized into 10 job duty areas. For the present analyses, Duty Area 4, "Assists enrollee in developing vocational goals and plans for attaining these goals," was divided into two subduty areas: (4-A) "Conducts or assists in conducting orientation and formal assessment;" and (4-B) "Works with enrollee to develop employability goals and plan." This list of duty areas is presented in Table 2-2.

The rating methodology and scoring procedures used with the JAI result in a percentage score for each task the individual performs, which is interpreted as an estimate of the relative amount of the individual's total time spent on the particular task. Thus, an individual's percentage scores for all the tasks performed total 100%. The individual's relative time score for a duty area is obtained by summing the percentage of total time scores he obtained on tasks within that duty area. Thus, an individual's duty area scores also represent a percentage of total time scores and, when summed over all duty areas, equal 100%.

For the present analyses, differences among teams were assessed based upon the relative emphasis they give to job-position specialization in distributing their effort over the different duty areas. To illustrate the procedure that was used, the duty area relative percentage time scores for a five-member team are presented in Table 2-3. The entries for each team member represent the JAI estimates of the percent of the member's total time spent in each duty area. For example, as shown in the table, it is estimated that the coach of the team spends 5.4% of his time in Duty Area 1 activities. The clerk's estimate (34.8%) suggests that this person spends more time than any other team member in this duty area, followed by the job developer with 9%. By subtracting the second relative time estimate (9.0%) from the first (34.8%), an index of the time expenditure that is unique to one job position (25.8%) is obtained. The relative time estimate for the team as a whole in Duty Area 1 is 59.4%, which serves as an index of the total effort the team

Table 2-2

Revised Description of Major Duty Areas From Job Activities Inventory (JAI)

Major Duty Area	Description	Task Statements	
		Number in Duty Area	Percent of Total
1	Receives and processes Welfare Department referral forms	7	8
2	Accomplishes enrollment and initial assessment of applicants	8	10
3	Accomplishes initial assignment of enrollee	5	6
4-A	Conducts or assists in conducting orientation and formal assessment	5	6
4-B	Works with enrollee to develop employability goals and plan	5	6
5	Assists enrollee in obtaining needed services and supervises his progress during enrollment	13	16
6	Conducts determinations in case of applicant/enrollee referred for determination decision	9	11
7	Provides education, work and training component resources to service the job-preparation needs of WIN enrollees	6	7
8	Develops and/or locates job opportunities for WIN enrollees	8	10
9	Performs internal team management functions necessary to coordinate and support team efforts with the individual enrollees	8	10
10	Performs clerical duties required for initiation and maintenance of records and preparation of reports	8	10
	Total	82	100

Table 2-3

Illustration and Computation of JAI Duty Area Scores and Indices of Job Position Specialization for a Five-Member Team

	Number in Major Duty Area											Team Total
	1	2	3	4-A	4-B	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Job Position												
Coach	5.4	3.9	0.0	6.2	0.0	41.1	7.0	2.3	20.2	3.9	10.1	
Counselor	1.6	6.4	11.2	12.0	16.0	17.6	3.2	17.6	8.8	1.6	4.0	
Job Developer	9.0	10.7	3.3	0.8	2.5	21.3	9.8	11.5	22.1	2.5	6.6	
Work-Training Specialist	8.6	7.9	5.3	0.0	4.6	17.8	17.1	12.5	7.2	15.1	3.9	
Clerk-Stenographer	34.8	28.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.0	
Duty Area Totals	59.4	57.2	19.8	19.0	23.1	97.8	37.1	43.9	58.3	23.1	61.6	500.3
Unique Effort	25.8	17.6	5.9	5.8	11.4	19.8	7.3	5.1	1.9	19.0	26.9	146.5
Job Position Specialization by Duty Area[a]	43.4	30.8	30.0	30.5	49.4	20.2	19.7	11.6	3.3	82.3	43.7	
Team's use of job position specialization, over all duty areas[b]												29%

[a] Unique Effort/Duty Area Total

[b] Team Total Unique Effort/Team Total Effort (146.5/500.3)

expended in this area. By dividing the index of unique time expenditure (25.8%) by the index of total team expenditure in Duty Area 1 (59.4%), an estimate is obtained indicating that 43% of the team's effort in this duty area is identified with one job position (i.e., the clerk's).

A summary assessment of the relative emphasis teams give to job-position specialization over all duty areas was computed by totaling the numerical values for unique time for each duty area and expressing it as a percentage of the team's total time effort. Thus, based upon these procedures, job-position specialization is reflected in 29% of the total effort of the team used as an illustration in Table 2-3. These estimates ranged from 10 to 58% for the site-visit and mail-sample teams, with a median value of approximately 25%. Analyses of team style of functioning in terms of division of labor (job-position specialization) referred to at the beginning of this chapter will be based on these summary estimates.

INDICES OF ACCOMPLISHMENT OF TEAM OBJECTIVES

ASSESSING CHARACTERISTICS OF TEAM-MEMBER INTERACTION

Characteristics of team-member interaction were assessed from two perspectives: clarity of role communication among members of the team, and the extent to which a team involves its members and the client in client-oriented decision-making.

Clarity of Role Communication

A questionnaire entitled Major Caseload Functions constituted the third section of the Work Activities Inventory booklet completed by each team member (Appendix E). This questionnaire consisted of a list of 13 major functions that teams would be expected to accomplish in the course of providing services to their enrollees. Items used by team members in rating their own and other team members' involvement in the accomplishment of major caseload functions are as follows:

(1) Receive and schedule referrals for enrollment.
(2) Enrollment of applicants.
(3) Assessment and identification of new enrollee's employability status and needs.
(4) Conduct of WIN Orientation and/or special employability preparation sessions.
(5) Development of formal or informal employability plans.
(6) Referral of enrollees to appropriate education, training, and work experience components.
(7) Supervision of enrollee's attendance and progress while enrolled in WIN.
(8) Securing job placement of enrollee at appropriate time.
(9) Conduct of Determinations.
(10) Location of facilities to provide needed education, training, and job experience components.
(11) Location and/or development of job opportunities for current or future enrollees.
(12) Provision of follow-up services to enrollees who have gained employment.
(13) Maintenance of a system of records on individual enrollees.

Team members described the nature of their own involvement and that of each of their fellow team members for each of the 13 functions by choosing, in each case, from one of three responses: The person is (a) directly involved in accomplishing this function;

(b) not directly involved; or, (c) not sure if the person is directly involved. Using the individual's self-report as the reference point, scores were obtained for each individual on each item reflecting the percentage of fellow team members who agreed with the individual's self-report, the percentage who disagreed, and the percentage who were uncertain about the individual's involvement in the particular function. This scoring procedure (Appendix A) represents the basic scoring procedure used for this questionnaire.

Data from this questionnaire were available only for the site-visit teams. This questionnaire, and the one dealing with rating team members' importance in decision making, were both included in the booklets sent to the mail sample. Although team members completed the Background Information and Job Activities Inventory sections of the booklet with no apparent difficulty, these two sections appeared to arouse resistance. In many instances in the mail sample, the team member completed his self-ratings, but failed to rate his fellow team members. In other instances, the idea of the ratings was apparently rejected altogether. The high frequency of incomplete data in the mail sample suggested that there were strong biasing factors affecting completion of these two questionnaires. Some resistance to completing these two questionnaires was initially encountered from members of many of the site-visit teams. However, in the site-visit sample, after a research staff member explained the purpose of the questions and the use that would be made of the information they provided, team-member cooperation was excellent.

The present analyses required the comparison of teams to study differences in clarity of role communication as it was reflected within the team as a unit. To accomplish this, average percent-agreement, average percent-disagreement, and average percent-ambiguity scores were computed for each team, based upon occupants of the basic team-member job positions (coach, counselor, job developer, work-training specialist and, when a team member, orientation specialist). These team averages were computed for each of the 13 questionnaire items; thus, the end results for each team were an average percent-agreement, an average percent-disagreement, and an average percent-ambiguity score for each of the 13 major caseload functions. As an aid in this and future discussion these average scores are referred to as team percent-agreement, team percent-disagreement, and team percent-ambiguity.

A summary assessment of a team's standing in comparison to the other teams was derived by computing the frequency distributions for the three scores on each of the 13 functions separately. Using the team percent-agreement scores as an example, the score value that was equaled or exceeded by 50% of the teams was identified for each of the 13 items. Each team was then awarded a summary percent-agreement score based upon a count of the number of items on which its team percent-agreement score equaled or exceeded the score value obtained by 50% of all teams. Thus, this summary percent-agreement score could range from 0 to 13. A score of 13 would mean that the team's percent-agreement scores had been in the upper 50% of the score distributions on each of the 13 caseload functions.

Following the procedure described, summary percent-disagreement and percent-ambiguity scores were computed for each team. These three summary percent scores are used as role communication criteria scores in studying the effectiveness of the different styles of decision functioning in accomplishing the communication and coordination objectives of the team concept.

Use of these role communication indices as criteria for assessing the accomplishment of team objectives rests on certain assumptions about the objectives of the team concept. The basic assumption of relevance here is that a major objective of the team is to provide, from the framework of the WIN Program, a coordinated plan of services tailored to meet the employability development needs of the individual enrollee. To the extent that a team is accomplishing this type of coordinated planning, team members would be expected to have a clear awareness of the extent of each others' involvement in the accomplishment of the team's major caseload functions. To the extent that the team has *not* accomplished this integrated type of functioning, team members would be expected to exhibit uncertainty or disagreement regarding each others' roles.

Relative Importance of Team Members and Client in Decision-Making

This questionnaire constituted the fourth and final section of the Work Activities Inventory (Appendix E). Its purpose was to obtain data regarding the team's perception of the relative importance of each of the team members and of the client in making decisions regarding client goals and the services to be provided. Team members rated the importance of self, each of the other team members separately, and client in making decisions in each of nine caseload decision areas. Items used by team members in rating the importance of self, other team members, and client in caseload decision-making are as follows:

(1) Identification of those who can be considered appropriate for enrollment and those who cannot.
(2) Identification of new enrollee as either job-ready or as in need of further employability preparation.
(3) Identification of initial component to which new enrollee will be assigned.
(4) Identification of feasible employment goals for the individual enrollee.
(5) Identification of education, training, and work experience components needed to enable the individual enrollee to attain his employment goals.
(6) Identification of when modifications or revisions in enrollee employability plans are required.
(7) Identification of the specific modifications or revisions of employability plans required for individual enrollee.
(8) Identification of the nature of follow-up services required by the individual enrollee.
(9) Identification of when it is appropriate to refer enrollee for termination.

The scoring of this questionnaire is discussed further in Appendix A. The basic scoring procedures of concern here are the average rating attributed to the individual by his fellow team members, and the average rating given the client by the members of the team. The discussion that follows will describe the use of these scores to produce an index of the relative homogeneity or heterogeneity of decision-making importance characterizing a team and the team's perception of the client.

In the analyses in this report, concern is focused upon spread of decision-making importance among team members and client. For example, Item 4 deals with decision-making importance in identifying feasible employability plan goals for a client. If, in rating the importance of each others' roles on this item, team members rated the counselor high (very important) and each other very low (little importance), this would indicate relatively little or no spread of decision-making importance on this team when deciding on client employability plan goals. If they also gave the client a very low rating, this would indicate that the client plays a relatively unimportant role in developing his or her employability plan goals.

Scoring for spread of decision-making importance was based upon the average ratings attributed to coaches, counselors, job developers, work-training specialists, and, when a regular member of the team, the orientation specialist. The clerks were not included on the basis of the observation that clerks generally are not involved in making client decisions, and, because they were not represented on each team, their inclusion would have biased the scoring. For the same reason, WIN team supervisors were not included unless they also were performing in one of the regular team-member roles. Finally, the specialized services staff were excluded from consideration because they do not function as members of a particular team. Thus, the result is to focus on the basic team-member staff in the same way used in identifying team members for the role communication scoring.

Spread of decision-making importance among team members was scored by inspecting the average attributed ratings obtained by each of the team members identified earlier, on each of the nine decision area items. The highest rating identified the "dominant" decision-maker for a given item. The average deviation of the other team members' ratings from the dominant decision-maker's rating was computed and, as such, defines spread of decision-making importance for that team on that decision area item. A large average deviation score indicates a large difference or discrepancy between the importance team members attributed to each other and the importance they attributed to the dominant decision-maker, and therefore, relatively little spread of decision-making importance among team members. A small average deviation score indicates that the decision-making importance team members attribute to each other is nearly equal to that given to the dominant decision-maker, therefore, decision-making importance is spread relatively evenly among team members.

A spread of decision-making score was computed separately for the client on each of the nine items by subtracting (algebraically) the average rating team members used to describe the client's importance from the average rating they used to describe the dominant team member's importance. Because the client's rating was not considered in identifying the dominant decision-maker in each area, the client could have conceivably been described as more important than the dominant team member. Six of the 50 teams rated the client dominant in one or two decision areas.

As a result of these scoring procedures, each team received two spread of decision-making scores on each of the nine decision area items—one describing spread of decision-making importance among team members (team deviation score), and the second describing spread of decision-making importance to the client (client deviation score).

Assessment of the team's standing as reflected by these two scores was summarized by following the general procedure described in the preceding section for obtaining the summary percent-agreement, -disagreement, and -ambiguity scores. For example, the distribution of team deviation scores for the 50 teams was computed for each of the nine decision area items separately. The score value separating the distribution for each item into the 25 highest and 25 lowest scoring teams was identified. Each team was then awarded a summary score based upon the number of items on which the team's score placed it among the 25 highest scoring teams. Thus, this summary score could range from zero to nine. A summary team score of nine would mean that this team, compared to the rest of the teams, gave most of its decision-making importance to one decision-maker in each of the nine caseload decision areas. A summary team score of zero would mean that this team, compared to the rest of the teams, involved its team members in decision-making to a level almost equal to that of the dominant decision-maker in all nine caseload decision areas.

A summary client score was derived for each team in the same manner as the summary team score. A summary client score of nine means that the team, in comparison to the other teams, perceives the client as having little involvement in decision-making in any of the nine caseload decision areas; a summary client score of zero, on the same basis, indicates that the team perceives the client as being involved in all areas at a level of importance almost equal to that of their dominant decision-makers.

Analyses involving decision-making importance (referred to at the beginning of this chapter) are based upon the summary team decision-making importance (DMI) score and the summary client DMI score.

The use of the team DMI score in assessing the accomplishment of WIN team objectives rests on the assumption that the team members represent different specialties, and, if the team is to use them effectively, the different members must be involved in decision-making and be perceived as making important (not necessarily dominant) contributions to this decision-making.

The major WIN team objective is the development of employability plans designed to meet the needs of the individual enrollee and to encourage and assist enrollees through to successful completion of these plans. It is assumed that, for the team to meet this objective, the client must be motivated and involved in the development of his or her own employability plans. To the extent that the team perceives the client as having little importance in client-oriented decision-making, it may be assumed that the team is doing little to involve the clients in decisions about their own employability development plans. It is from this frame of reference that the summary client DMI score is to be used as an index of accomplishment of WIN team objectives.

MONTHLY CASELOAD STATUS REPORTS

Each WIN project is required to provide the Office of Manpower Management Data Systems (OMMDS), Department of Labor, with a monthly summary report showing the number of new enrollments, number of terminations, and the internal program or component status of current enrollees. Based upon these reports (designated the MA-5-16 reports), OMMDS prepares a cumulative summary report for each WIN project. Data used in the present report as indices of team accomplishment in the provision of caseload services are derived from these monthly summaries.

These summaries consist of two separate sections. One reports cumulative enrollment and termination data, along with a condensed version of current enrollment for each project; the other shows the distribution of the current enrollment figures for the month over the different program components for each project. These two sections were used in the present study as a basis for computing the average caseload volume of a particular project during a three-month span, and also to compute the average monthly distribution of this caseload over the different program components and termination categories. The three-month period used was October 1, 1970 to January 1, 1971. The original plans were for a six-month period from October 1, 1970 to April 1, 1971, which would have bracketed the period of data collection from these teams. However, apparently because of changes in the method of production of the monthly summaries at OMMDS, only the cumulative program statistics section of the monthly reports was distributed during the first half of 1971.

An average monthly caseload volume was computed for each project for this three-month period. The project's caseload volume for a particular month was considered as including both the clients they terminated and those in current enrollment status. Therefore, in order to derive average monthly caseload volume from the monthly OMMDS reports, average monthly terminations and current enrollment had to be computed and added together.

Average monthly terminations were obtained for a project by subtracting its cumulative termination figure for the beginning of the period (September 30, 1970) from the corresponding figures at the end of the period (December 31, 1970), and dividing by three. Average monthly current enrollment was computed by obtaining the sum of the total monthly current enrollment figures (including enrollees in "suspense") and dividing it by the number of months.

The monthly caseload volume was divided into nine subcategories, as shown in Table 2-4. Following the same general procedures used for computing average monthly

Table 2-4

Subcategorization of the Average Monthly Caseload Volume[a]

Accomplishment Index	Composition (OMMDS Summary Report Categories)
1. %Volume—Initial Hold	Holding status prior to assignment to initial component
2. % Volume—Orientation and Assessment	Orientation and assessment component
3. % Volume—all WIN Education, Work and Training Components	Basic education, vocational training, on-the-job training, "other" training, work experience, special work projects, "other" job experience
4. % Volume—General Holding Status	Program-related hold and nonprogram-related hold
5. % Volume—Completed Training	Job entry hold and in job entry component
6. % Volume—Job Entry	In job entry component
7. % Volume—Abort Program	Termination subcategories: "dropout" and "other"
8. % Volume—Completed Job Entry	Termination subcategory: completed job entry period
9. % Volume—Suspense	WIN suspense: enrollees receiving services from other manpower programs

[a] Based on WIN project monthly summary reports to the Office of Manpower Management Data Systems (OMMDS), Department of Labor.

terminations and current enrollment, the mean number of enrollees reported in each of these subcategories during the three-month period was computed for each WIN project. The mean for each subcategory was then expressed as a percentage of the total average monthly caseload volume for that project. There is an overlap between only two of the nine subcategories shown in Table 2-4—Percent Volume Completed Training, no. 5, and Percent Volume in Job Entry, no. 6. If the latter is disregarded, the Percent Volume values for the remaining eight subcategories total 100% for the given project.

As indicated previously, the original research plan was to use a six-month period as the base for computing a team's average monthly caseload figures. While this was not possible for statistics based upon current caseload reporting, the monthly sections of the OMMDS report dealing with cumulative enrollment and termination data for each project were available. Therefore, successful enrollee completion rates (successful completions as percentage of total terminations) were computed for a given project, based on its total terminations and job-entry period completions for the six months from October 1, 1970 to April 1, 1971.

As mentioned earlier, the monthly summary reports distributed by OMMDS provide these caseload status figures for each WIN project, identified by project number and state. A WIN project may represent one team at one office location, a number of teams at one office location, or a number of WIN teams scattered over several locations. The primary interest in the caseload statistics was in exploring their possible usefulness as indices of the team's accomplishment in delivering program services. This required the capability of identifying caseload statistics for the enrollment of a specific team. Information from each state regarding numbers of offices and of teams at each office within each project provided the base needed to match both site-visit and mail-sample office locations with the data presented by project in the OMMDS monthly summary reports.

A set of rules was imposed in qualifying project caseload statistics for use in the present study, the basic one being that the project must consist of only one office location. This ensured that, for a single-team office, project caseload data would be for the caseload of that team. For multi-team offices, however, the data would reflect the caseloads of all the teams in the office. Another rule was that, in multi-team offices, the caseload figures divided by the number of teams in the office would be accepted as a reasonable estimate of the caseload activity of the team in the sample.

The monthly summary report of program statistics for December 1970 listed 283 projects for the 43-state sampling pool of this study. Using the information obtained from the states to identify the number of office locations in each project, 239 (84%) of these projects were identified as single-office location projects. Of the 50 site-visit offices, 35 (70%) were identified as single-office location projects—thus projects for which team and team caseload statistics could be matched in a meaningful way. Of the 59 mail-sample offices, 37 (63%) qualified for inclusion in the study of team and team caseload statistics.

OFFICE, TEAM, AND TEAM-MEMBER CHARACTERISTICS

Data regarding team-staffing patterns, length of time members had served on the team, length of members' pre-WIN service as Employment Service (ES) employees, members' formal education and their exposure to WIN team in-service training were described in the Phase 1 report of this study (10). Data regarding team member characteristics were obtained from the Background Information section of the Work Activities Inventory booklet completed by each team member (Appendix E), and team-staffing pattern data were obtained from the WIN office supervisor (Appendix C).

The office, team, and team-member characteristics used in the present analyses are defined as follows:

WIN Office Experience (OE). The number of months the WIN office had been in operation was obtained from the WIN office supervisor during site-visit interviews. In the present analyses, teams were classified into one of two categories based on the midpoint of the distribution of months of OE for the 50 site-visit teams.

Team-Staffing Patterns (SP). The diversity of staffing patterns represented in the two samples made it necessary to contrast the full five-team-member pattern with all other patterns. Thus, teams staffed with the coach, counselor, job developer, work-training specialist, and clerical positions were identified as "full" SP teams, and those with less as "incomplete" SP teams.

Number of Team Members (TR). For determination of the number of individual respondents on the team, "team" was defined by the office supervisor's identification of the individuals who worked as a team in providing caseload services to a single, common, or mutually shared caseload. In addition to the five regular team member positions, this definition also included team supervisors and orientation specialists when identified as regular team members. Excluded were the specialized service personnel who provide services to the caseloads of more than one team or are not considered a member of the team. Teams were classified into two categories: six to 10 members and fewer than six members.

Team Experience (TE). The mean number of months team members reported having served on the team was computed for each team. Team members were defined as described for Number of Team Members (TR). Teams were then classified into one of two categories based on the midpoint of the distribution of months-TE for the 50 site-visit teams and, separately, for the 59 mail-sample teams. Team experience was also subdivided into team Leader Experience (LE) and Follower Experience (FE) with teams then classified into one of two categories based on the midpoint of the respective distributions.

Employment Service (ES) Experience Prior to WIN (P-ES). The number of team members (WIN Supervisor's definition as in TR, TE, and TT) who had served as ES employees prior to their WIN assignment was tallied for each team and expressed as a percentage of the total number of members on that team.

Team Training (TT). This variable is based upon the individual's response to the question "Since joining the WIN staff, have you received training which you consider directly relevant to your current WIN job duties?" The number of team members (as defined for TR) responding "Yes" to this question was tallied and expressed as a percentage of the total number for that team. Teams were classified into one of two categories based on the midpoint of the distribution for the 50 site-visit teams and, separately, the distribution for the 59 mail-sample teams.

Chapter 3

DATA ANALYSES AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

OVERVIEW

The general objectives of the present analyses were to study data reflecting accomplishment of team objectives as a function of two different classes of variables: team style of functioning and team experience, training, and staffing characteristics. Analyses were carried out by first dichotomizing the frequency distributions for each of the variables on the basis of either the median (or closest approximation) of the distribution, or the attributes described by the variable. These variables and the basis on which they were dichotomized are presented in Tables 3-1 to 3-3 for the site-visit sample and Tables 3-4 to 3-6 for the mail sample. Analyses of the relationships between variables were carried out by comparing the teams' "high" or "low" status on one variable with their "high" or "low" status on another variable in a series of 2 × 2 contingency tables.

An example of the basic 2 × 2 contingency tables computed in analyzing the relationship between the team training (TT) variable and style of decision functioning (DF) among the teams in the site-visit sample is presented in Table 3-7. Three 2 × 2 tables were computed: one for the 50 teams together, one for teams from single-team offices only, and one for teams from multi-team offices only. Because the score values used to define high and low halves of the score distribution were based upon the distributions for all 50 teams, adding the frequencies in the 2 × 2 table for single-team offices to the corresponding cell frequencies in the table for multi-team offices produced the entries shown for "All Site-Visit Teams."

In Table 3-8, the form in which these same data are presented in this report is shown. Entries in this table are percentages rather than frequencies—that is, the percentage of all teams classified as having low DF scores that also had high TT scores, and the percentage of all teams having high DF scores that also had high TT scores. For example, the percentages for the total site-visit sample show that 30% (8 out of 27) of the low DF score teams had high team training (TT) scores; in contrast, 70% (16 out of 23) of the teams having high DF scores also had high team training scores.

A chi-square (computed from the frequency data shown in the 2 × 2 contingency Table 3-7) indicates that the positive relationship between DF and TT scores suggested by these percentages was statistically significant ($p < .02$). These data will be presented again and discussed later in this chapter; the purpose of the present discussion is only to illustrate the form in which study data will be reported. It is possible to reconstruct the full 2 × 2 contingency tables shown in Table 3-7 by using the Ns (number of teams) and percentages provided in the format to be used in this report (Table 3-8).

Chi-square (corrected for continuity) and the Fisher exact probability test were used to identify relationships between variables that warrant consideration in drawing conclusions (12). This report considers relationships between variables worthy of note when application of these tests produces probability values falling between the .10 and .05 levels of confidence; probability values at or less than .05 will be considered to identify relationships that are sufficiently clear to use as a basis for drawing conclusions.

Table 3-1

Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Dichotomizing of Variables			
	Basis	High	Low	High N/Low N
A. Experience				
1. Months WIN offices have operated (OE) Empirical range: 6-33 mo.	Nearest midpoint	≥29 mo.	<29 mo.	24/26
2. Team member's average months experience on given team (TE) Empirical range: 3.4-27.3 mo.	Nearest midpoint	≥15 mo.	<15 mo.	25/25
3. Team leader's months experience on given team (LE) Empirical range: 4-30 mo.	Nearest midpoint	≥16 mo.	<16 mo.	25/25
4. Team member's average months experience on given team, excluding team leader (FE) Empirical range: 2.8-28 mo.	Nearest midpoint	≥13.8 mo.	<13.8 mo.	24/26
5. Percent of team members employed by Employment Service prior to WIN assignment (P-ES) Empirical range: 0-100%	Nearest midpoint	≥50%	<50%	29/21
B. Training				
1. Percent of team members exposed to inservice WIN team training (TT) Empirical range: 40-100%	Nearest midpoint	≥78%	<78%	24/26
2. Team leader inservice team training (LT)	Attribute	Yes	No	39/11
3. Percent of team members, excluding leader, exposed to WIN team training (FT) Empirical range: 33-100%	Nearest midpoint	≥83%	<83%	23/27
C. Staffing				
1. Team staffing pattern: number of the five basic positions included (SP) Empirical Range: 2-5 of the five basic positions	Attribute	5	2-4	20/30
2. Number of team members (TR) Empirical range: 2-10	Nearest midpoint	6-10	2-5	18/32

Table 3-2

Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Team Style of Functioning Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Dichotomizing of Variables			
	Basis	High	Low	High N/Low N
A. Style of Functioning in Decision-Making				
1. Summary style of decision functioning score (DF) Possible DF score range: 0-16 Empirical range: 1-16	Nearest midpoint	>8	<8	23/27
Subcomponents of DF score				
(a) Time-phasing of decision points (dt) Possible score range: 0-3 Empirical range: 0-3 Basis: employability plan (EP) decisions made separate from other decisions (2-3) vs. conjointly (0-1)	Attributes	2-3	0-1	31/19
(b) Enrollment and initial assignment alternatives (alt.) Possible score range: 0-3 Empirical range: 0-3 Basis: Initial assignment alternatives (2-3) vs. no initial assignment alternatives (0-1)	Attributes	2-3	0-1	26/24
(c) Team member-client contacts prior to decision point (mc) Possible score range: 0-5 Empirical range: 0-5 Basis: multiple member contacts with client prior to separate EP decision point (3-5) vs. none or only prior to EP decisions made conjointly with other decisions (0-2)	Attributes	3-5	0-2	29/21

Continued

Table 3-2 *(Continued)*

Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Team Style of Functioning Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Dichotomizing of Variables			
	Basis	High	Low	High N/Low N
(d) Form of decision interaction (tc) Possible score range: 0-5 Empirical range: 0-5 Basis: EP decisions made at separate decision point and in team conference (3-5) vs. EP decisions made conjointly with or without team conference (0-2)	Attributes	3-5	0-2	21/29
B. Style of Functioning in Division of Labor				
1. Summary job position specialization exhibited by team (JP-S) Possible score range: 0-100% Empirical range: 10%-54%	Nearest midpoint	>24%	<24%	25/25

Table 3-3

Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Indices of Accomplishment of Team Objectives: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Dichotomizing of Variables			
	Basis	High	Low	High N/Low N
A. Characteristics of Team Member Interaction				
1. Clarity of role communication				
(a) Team Summary Percent Agreement Score (S%A) Possible range: 0-13 Empirical range: 0-12	Nearest midpoint	≥7	<7	26/24
(b) Team Summary Percent Disagreement Score (S%D) Possible range: 0-13 Empirical range: 2-11	Nearest midpoint	≥7	<7	26/24
(c) Team Summary Percent Ambiguity Score (S%U) Possible range: 0-13 Empirical range: 0-12	Nearest midpoint	≥6	<6	27/23
2. Spread of Decision-Making Importance Among Team Members and Client				
(a) Summary Team Decision-Making Importance Score (Tm-DMI) Possible range: 0-9 Empirical range: 0-9	Nearest midpoint	≥5	<5	22/28
(b) Summary Client Decision-Making Importance Score (Cl-DMI) Possible range: 0-9 Empirical range: 0-9	Nearest midpoint	≥5	<5	24/26
B. Team's Monthly Caseload Status Reports				
1. Percent of terminations 1 Oct. 70 to 1 Apr. 71 who successfully completed Job Entry period (6-mo. placement rate) Empirical range: 0-60%	Nearest midpoint	≥25%	<25%	18/17

(Continued)

Table 3-3 *(Continued)*

Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Indices of Accomplishment of Team Objectives: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Dichotomizing of Variables			
	Basis	High	Low	High N/Low N
2. Average Monthly Caseload Enrollment 1 Oct. 70 to 1 Jan 71 (3-mo. Average Caseload) Empirical range: 12-323	Nearest midpoint	≥181	<181	17/18
3. Initial Hold (% Vol.) Empirical range: 0-95.7%	Nearest midpoint	≥7.4%	<7.4%	17/18
4. Percent average monthly caseload in Orientation and Assessment Component (% Vol.—O & A) Empirical range: 0-34.3%	Nearest midpoint	≥5.2%	<5.2%	1[illegible]8
5. All WIN Education, Training, and Work Experience Components (% Vol. WIN Training) Empirical range: 0-67.6%	Nearest midpoint	≥42.8%	<42.8%	17/18
6. Program- and Nonprogram-Related Hold (% Vol.—General Hold) Empirical range: 0-40%	Nearest midpoint	≥13.2%	<13.2%	17/18
7. Job-Entry Hold and In-Job Entry Component (% Vol.—Completed Training) Empirical range: 0-34.6%	Nearest midpoint	≥18.3%	<18.3%	17/18
8. Job Entry (% Vol.) Empirical range: 0-24.5%	Nearest midpoint	≥11.3%	<11.3%	17/18
9. Average monthly "Dropout" and "Other" combined and expressed as percent of average monthly caseload (% Vol.—Abort Program) Empirical range: 0-11.5%	Nearest midpoint	≥3.9%	<3.9%	18/17
10. Completed Job Entry (% Vol.) Empirical range: 0-7.1%	Nearest midpoint	≥1.5%	<1.5%	16/19
11. Suspense (% Vol.) Empirical range: 0-16.2%	Nearest midpoint	≥4.6%	<4.6%	17/18

Table 3-4

Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Experience, Training and Staffing Variables: Sample

Variable	Dichotomizing of Variables			
	Basis	High	Low	High N/Low N
A. Experience				
1. Team members average months experience on team (TE) Empirical range: 5-30 mo.	Nearest midpoint	>15 mo.	<15 mo.	32/27
2. Team leader's months experience on team (LE) Empirical range: 2-30 mo.	Nearest midpoint	>20 mo.	<20 mo.	26/33
3. Team member's average months experience on team, excluding team leader (FE) Empirical range: 3-29.4 mo.	Nearest midpoint	>15.8 mo.	<15.8 mo.	29/30
4. Percent of team members employed by Employability Service prior to WIN assignment (P-ES) Empirical range: 0-100%	Nearest midpoint	>57%	<57%	23/36
B. Training				
1. Percent team members with inservice WIN team training (TT) Empirical range: 20-100%	Nearest midpoint	>80%	<80%	31/28
2. Team leader inservice team training (LT)	Attribute	Yes	No	48/11
3. Percent of team members, excluding leader, with WIN team training (FT) Empirical range: 0-100%	Nearest midpoint	>80%	<80%	30/29
C. Staffing				
1. Team staffing pattern: number of five basic positions included (SP) Empirical range: 1-5 of five basic positions	Attribute	5	1-4	15/44
2. Number of team members on team (TR) Empirical range: 2-10	Nearest midpoint	6-10	2-5	19/40

Table 3-5

Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Team Style of Functioning Variables: Mail Sample

Variable	Dichotomizing of Variables			
	Basis	High	Low	High N/Low N
A. Style of Functioning Division of Labor				
1. Summary job position specialization exhibited by team (JP-S) Possible score range: 0-100% Empirical range: 10-58%	Nearest midpoint	≥26%	<26%	29/30

Table 3-6

Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Indices of Accomplishment of Team Objectives: Mail Sample

Variable	Dichotomizing of Variables			
	Basis	High	Low	High N/Low N
A. Team's Monthly Caseload Status Reports				
1. Percent of terminations 1 Oct. 70 to 1 Apr. 71 who successfully completed the Job Entry period (6-mo. Placement Rate) Empirical range: 3-56%	Nearest midpoint	≥24%	<24%	19/18
2. Average Monthly Caseload Enrollment 1 Oct. 70 to 1 Jan. 71 (3-mo. Average Caseload) Empirical range: 64-288	Nearest midpoint	≥150	<150	18/19
3. Initial Hold (% Vol.) Empirical range: 0-18.3%	Nearest midpoint	≥0.9%	<0.9%	18/19
4. Percent of average monthly caseload in Orientation and Assessment Component (% Vol.—O & A) Empirical range: 0-18.7%	Nearest midpoint	≥5.9%	<5.9%	19/18
5. All WIN Education, Training, and Work Experience Components (% Vol.—WIN Training) Empirical range: 24.3-76.7%	Nearest midpoint	≥53.9%	<53.9%	18/19

(Continued)

Table 3-6 *(Continued)*

Scores or Attributes Used as the Basis for Dichotomizing Variables for Analysis of Indices of Accomplishment of Team Objectives: Mail Sample

Variable	Dichotomizing of Variables			
	Basis	High	Low	High N/Low N
6. Program-Related and Non-Program-Related Hold (% Vol.—General Hold) Empirical range: 1.1-23.3%	Nearest midpoint	> 8.4%	< 8.4%	18/19
7. Job-Entry Hold and In Job-Entry Component (% Vol.—Completed Training) Empirical range: 4.0-34.1%	Nearest midpoint	> 14.4%	< 14.4%	18/19
8. Job Entry (% Vol.) Empirical range: 1.7-23.2%	Nearest midpoint	> 10.7%	< 10.7%	18/19
9. Average Monthly "Dropout" and "Other" combined and expressed as % average monthly caseload (% Vol.—Abort Program) Empirical range: 1.4-17.4%	Nearest midpoint	> 4.0%	< 4.0%	18/19
10. Completed Job Entry (% Vol.) Empirical range: 0-4.2%	Nearest midpoint	> 1.3%	< 1.3%	18/19
11. Suspense (% Vol.) Empirical range: 0.3-22.2%	Nearest midpoint	> 4.1%	< 4.1%	18/19

Table 3-7

Illustration of Data Analyses Used in This Report—Basic 2 x 2 Contingency Tables

Variable[a]	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	Low DF	High DF	Total	Low DF	High DF	Total	Low DF	High DF	Total
High TT	8	16	24	6	14	20	2	2	4
Low TT	19	7	26	7	4	11	12	3	15
Total	27	23	50	13	18	31	14	5	19

[a] Percent of members of each team who received in-service WIN Team Training (TT)

Table 3-8

Illustration of Form of Data Presentation Used in This Report—

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Style of Decision Functioning Scores That Were in the Category for Experience, Training and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low DF (N=27)	High DF (N=23)	N	Low DF (N=13)	High DF (N=18)	N	Low DF (N=14)	High DF (N=5)
High TT	24	30	70**a	20	46	78	4	14	40

$^a\chi^2$ (1 df) = 6.42, $p < .02$

RELATIONSHIP OF OFFICE AND TEAM CHARACTERISTICS TO TEAM STYLE OF FUNCTIONING

TWO STYLES OF FUNCTIONING VARIABLES

Style of decision functioning scores (DF) were derived from the Team Leader Interview, and thus are available only for the site-visit sample. Derivation of these scores was described in Chapter 2. Briefly, they were designed to reflect a continuum concerned with the nature and extent of decision-making communication and coordination among team members. High DF scores describe team members practicing a closely integrated style of decision-making (team-process model); low DF scores describe decision-making centered on the individual specialist with no necessary decision-making communication or coordination taking place among team members (specialist-process model).

These descriptions represent the two extremes of the continuum. Thus, the closer the team's DF score is to zero, the closer this team corresponds to the low level or absence of decision-making communication and coordination characteristic of the specialist-process model. The closer the team's score is to the maximum (16), the closer this team corresponds to the high level of decision-making communication and coordination among team members characteristic of the team-process model. In the present analyses, DF scores of 1 through 7 were classified as low and scores of 8 to 16 were classified as high (Table 3-2).

Job position specialization (JP-S) scores represent the second team style of functioning variable, division of labor. The definition of job position specialization and the procedure followed in computing it for each team are described in Chapter 2. In brief, the job position specialization score for a team reflects the extent to which effort expended by a given job position dominated, or was in excess of, that expended by each of the other job positions in each of the duty areas contained in the Job Activities Inventory. These excess time values were summed for all the duty areas in the JAI and expressed as a percentage of the team's total effort (i.e., total relative time scores). Dichotomization of the resulting scores for the present analyses is described in Table 3-2 for the site-visit sample and in Table 3-5 for the mail sample.

FINDINGS

The objectives of this section of the analyses are to explore the data for evidence of relationships between team experience, training, and staffing variables, and the two style of team functioning variables. Because of the number of variables involved, this discussion attempts only to summarize the major conclusions perceived as important in reviewing the tables to be presented.

Style of Decision Functioning

Team Experience, Training, and Staffing in Relation to Style of Decision Functioning. As has been noted, style of decision functioning data are available only for the 50 site-visit teams. Table 3-9 indicates that experience and staffing variables are not importantly related to team style of decision making as reflected by the DF scores. However, this table does indicate that in-service WIN training has had an impact upon teams' style of decision making, and that the extent of this impact is related to the proportion of the team's members who have been exposed to this training.

According to the data in Table 3-9, teams with style of functioning that was closest to the team-process model were predominantly characterized by a large proportion (78-100%) of their members having received in-service WIN training. Conversely, style of functioning closest to the specialist-process model occurred predominantly among teams characterized by a lower proportion (40-77%) of members who have been exposed to in-service WIN training.

Thirty-nine of the 50 team leaders (or senior team member where a team leader was not formally designated) had received in-service WIN training. This proportion (78%) of WIN-trained leaders was sufficiently high to leave little room for the study of the effects of trained vs. nontrained leaders on team style of decision-making. Table 3-9 shows that the teams of leaders (LT) who had received WIN training were represented evenly in the low and high DF score categories for the 50 teams. Follower's training (FT: percent of team members who had received WIN training, excluding team leader) shows a trend in relating to style of decision making that is similar to, but not so strong as, that shown for the full team (TT). These data suggest that the impact of training on style of decision functioning is greatest when all team members, including the leader, have had the training; they also imply that the impact of training on team style of functioning is diluted rapidly when two or more members of the team have not received WIN training.

Relationship of DF Components to Team Characteristics. Style of decision functioning scores were obtained on four components of the decision process, referred to as decision-style attributes: (a) Time-phasing of decisions (dt) regarding enrollment, initial assignment, and employability plan goals; (b) presence or absence of decision alternatives at enrollment and initial assignment (alt); (c) number (single vs. multiple) of team members having decision-related contact with the client prior to making the decision (mc); (d) team style of interacting in accomplishing the decision (tc).

Relationships between each of the four decision-style attributes and team experience, training, and staffing characteristics were studied by dichotomizing the weighted scores for each decision style attribute on a rational rather than frequency distribution basis. These dichotomies are explained in Table 3-2. Tables 3-10 through 13 summarize the 2 × 2 contingency tables computed to explore the relationship between each decision style attribute and team experience, training, and staffing characteristics.

Only one of the four decision style attributes shows evidence of a statistically significant relationship with team characteristics. Table 3-13 indicates that teams that used team conferences the most, particularly a separate team conference for employability plan decisions (i.e., high tc) were predominantly those whose members had the shortest average periods of time in working together (FE: average team member months of service on the team excluding the team leader/senior team member; High FE > 13.8 months). These teams also tended to be those comprised of a higher proportion of members who have received in-service WIN training.

Table 3-9

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Decision Functioning Scores That Were in the High Category for Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample

[illegible]es	Style of Decision Functioning Scores (DF)(%)[a]								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low DF (N=27)	High DF (N=23)	N	Low DF (N=13)	High DF (N=18)	N	Low DF (N=14)	High DF (N=5)
H[illegible]E	24	59	35	9	46	17	15	71	100
[illegible]gh TE	25	52	48	15	46	50	10	57	40
High LE	25	56	43	16	54	50	9	57	20
High FE	24	59	35	14	62	33	10	57	40
High P-ES	29	67	48	16	54	50	13	78	40
High TT	24	30	70**[b]	20	46	78	4	14	40
High LT	39	78	78	26	85	83	13	71	60
High FT	23	33	61*[c]	18	46	67	5	21	40
Full SP	20	44	35	14	54	39	6	36	20
High TR	18	41	30	13	54	33	5	29	20

[a] Throughout the tables in Chapter 3, ** indicates statistical significance at the .05 level or better; * indicates statistical significance between .05 and .10.

[b] χ^2 (1 *df*)=6.42, $p < .02$.

[c] χ^2 (1 *df*)=2.76, $p < .10$.

Table 3-10

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Decision Timing Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Time-Phasing of Decisions (dt) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low dt (N=19)	High dt (N=31)	N	Low dt (N=12)	High dt (N=19)	N	Low dt (N=7)	High dt (N=12)
High OE	24	63	39	9	50	16	15	86	75
High TE	25	53	48	15	42	53	10	71	42
High LE	25	58	45	16	58	47	9	57	42
High FE	24	63	39	14	58	37	10	71	42
High P-ES	29	63	55	16	58	47	13	71	67
High TT	24	37	55	20	50	74	4	14	25
High LT	39	79	77	26	83	84	13	71	67
High FT	23	42	48	18	50	63	5	28	33
Full SP	20	47	35	14	67	32	6	14	42
High TR	18	47	29	13	50	37	5	43	17

Table 3-11

Percentage of Teams With and Without Initial Assignment Alternatives That Were in the High Category for Team Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Initial Assignment Alternatives (alt.) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Without (N=24)	With (N=26)	N	Without (N=11)	With (N=20)	N	Without (N=13)	With (N=6)
High OE	24	50	46	9	9	40	15	85	67
High TE	25	46	54	15	45	50	10	46	67
High LE	25	54	46	16	64	45	9	46	50
High FE	24	38	58	14	27	55	10	46	67
High P-ES	29	54	62	16	54	50	13	54	100
High TT	24	46	50	20	73	60	4	23	17
High LT	39	75	81	26	73	90	13	77	50
High FT	23	46	46	18	64	55	5	31	17
Full SP	20	33	46	14	27	55	6	38	17
High TR	18	21	50	13	27	50	5	15	50

Table 3-12

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Member Contact Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Team Member Contact Scores (mc) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low mc (N=21)	High mc (N=29)	N	Low mc (N=12)	High mc (N=19)	N	Low mc (N=9)	High mc (N=10)
High OE	24	62	38	9	50	16	15	78	80
High TE	25	48	52	15	42	53	10	56	50
High LE	25	52	48	16	58	47	9	44	50
High FE	24	57	41	14	58	37	10	56	50
High P-ES	29	67	52	16	58	47	13	78	60
High TT	24	33	59	20	50	74	4	11	30
High LT	39	81	76	26	83	84	13	78	60
High FT	23	38	52	18	50	63	5	22	30
Full SP	20	52	31	14	67	32	6	33	30
High TR	18	43	31	13	50	37	5	33	20

Table 3-13

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Conference Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Team Conference Scores (tc) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Team			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low tc (N=29)	High tc (N=21)	N	Low tc (N=15)	High tc (N=16)	N	Low tc (N=14)	High tc (N=5)
High OE	24	59	33	9	47	12	15	71	100
High TE	25	59	38	15	53	44	10	64	20
High LE	25	55	43	16	53	50	9	57	20
High FE	24	66	24**[a]	14	67	25**[b]	10	64	20
High P-ES	29	69	43	16	60	44	13	78	40
High TT	24	38	62	20	53	75	4	21	20
High LT	39	79	76	26	87	81	13	71	60
High FT	23	34	62	18	47	69	5	21	40
Full SP	20	45	33	14	60	31	6	29	40
High TR	18	41	29	13	53	31	5	29	20

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*)=6.89, $p<.01$.
[b] χ^2 (1 *df*)=3.87, $p<.05$.

Style of Functioning in Terms of Job Position Specialization

Team Experience, Training, and Staffing in Relation to Job Position Specialization. Data relating team characteristics to their use of job position specialization are available for both the site-visit and the mail sample. Data for the site-visit sample, presented in Table 3-14, suggest that teams that made the greatest use of job position specialization tended to be the less experienced ones (i.e., TE: average of team members months of experience on the team) with relatively few members who had received WIN training (TT: percent of team's members who received WIN training). It is noted that this interpretation applies primarily to the site-visit teams from the single-team offices.

Corresponding data for the teams comprising the mail sample are presented in Table 3-15. None of the 2 × 2 contingency tables summarized in this table produced evidence of statistically significant relationships. Thus, it was concluded that the relationship between team training (TT), team experience (TE), and job position specialization (JP-S) was dependent upon a number of conditions that were not so pronounced among teams in the mail sample. However, the data for the mail sample single-team offices showed a numerical trend consistent with the findings in the site-visit sample.

Relationship Between Style of Decision Functioning and Job Position Specialization

A summary of 2 × 2 contingency tables computed to explore the relationship between job position specialization and style of decision functioning scores is presented in Table 3-16, which also includes each of the four components upon which the style of decision functioning score was based. This table indicates that there is no relationship

Table 3-14

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in the High Category for Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Extent of Job Position Specialization (JP-S) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low JP-S (N=25)	High JP-S (N=25)	N	Low JP-S (N=19)	High JP-S (N=12)	N	Low JP-S (N=6)	High JP-S (N=13)
High OE	24	20	56	9	32	33	15	67	85
High TE	25	64	36*[a]	15	68	17**[b]	10	50	54
High LE	25	56	44	16	63	33	9	33	54
High FE	24	56	40	14	58	25	10	50	54
High P-ES	29	52	64	16	47	58	13	67	69
High TT	24	64	32**[c]	20	79	42*[d]	4	17	23
High LT	39	84	72	26	89	75	13	67	69
High FT	23	60	32*[e]	18	68	42	5	33	23
Full SP	20	52	28	14	53	33	6	50	23
High TR	18	44	28	13	53	33	5	17	31

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*)=2.88, $p<.10$.
[b] χ^2 (1 *df*)=5.95, $p<.02$.
[c] χ^2 (1 *df*)=3.92, $p<.05$.
[d] χ^2 (1 *df*)=2.98, $p<.10$.
[e] χ^2 (1 *df*)=2.90, $p<.10$.

Table 3-15

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in the High Category for Experience, Training, and Staffing Variables: Mail Sample

Variable	Extent of Job Position Specialization (JP-S) (%)								
	All Mail Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low JP-S (N=30)	High JP-S (N=29)	N	Low JP-S (N=23)	High JP-S (N=21)	N	Low JP-S (N=7)	High JP-S (N=8)
High TE	32	53	55	24	61	48	8	29	75
High LE	26	30	59	17	26	52	9	43	75
High FE	29	53	45	21	57	38	8	43	62
High P-ES	23	53	24	16	52	19	7	57	38
High TT	31	60	45	25	65	48	6	43	38
High LT	48	77	86	34	70	86	14	100	88
High FT	30	50	52	24	52	57	6	43	38
Full SP	15	40	10	11	35	14	4	57	00
High TR	19	37	28	15	39	29	4	29	25

between DF scores, or its component scores, and extent of job position specialization used by the teams in dividing job-duty effort among the various team members.

The significance of this table lies in its assertion that the style of decision-making communication and coordination used by a team is not directly tied to the extent of specialization practiced by occupants of the different job positions. Thus, teams that tend to divide duty responsibilities by job position specialties are as likely to fall at either end of the style of decision-making continuum (team-process model vs. specialist-process model) as are teams that appear to give little recognition to job position specialties.

Table 3-16

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in the High Category for Decision Functioning Scores: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Extent of Job Position Specialization (JP-S) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low JP-S (N=25)	High JP-S (N=25)	N	Low JP-S (N=19)	High JP-S (N=12)	N	Low JP-S (N=6)	High JP-S (N=13)
High DF	23	56	36	18	58	58	5	17	31
High dt	31	60	64	19	58	67	12	67	62
High alt.	26	56	48	20	68	58	6	17	38
High mc	29	56	60	19	58	67	10	50	54
High tc	21	44	40	16	53	50	5	17	31

SUMMARY: TEAM CHARACTERISTICS AND STYLE OF FUNCTIONING

WIN team training has generally stressed the importance of frequent exchange of information, close coordination, and involvement of all team members as well as the client during employability planning and decision making. To achieve these objectives, the types of practices frequently recommended have involved all team members interacting with the client prior to decision making and the use of team conferences to accomplish planning and decision making.

Present data indicate that when all team members have received WIN team training, teams have tended to adopt these practices. However, it appears that having only two or so members who have not received team training can block or disrupt whatever influence the training had on the remaining team members and, consequently, on the team as a whole.

Although the preceding condition must be considered, team training appears to have two major effects that tend to apply differentially depending upon the length of time team members have worked together:

(1) Team training encourages utilization of the types of communication and coordination practices described above as being generally stressed in training. Teams whose team members have worked together for the shorter periods of time (less than 15 months) are particularly likely to adopt these practices, especially the use of team conferences, when all (or nearly all) members have received team training,

(2) Team training appears to influence the way teams distribute work load among the job position specialties represented on the team. When all (or nearly all) team members have received training, the team tends to deemphasize the "exclusive" rights of given job positions to given work activities and involves the various team members to a greater extent in all phases of the employability development process. This is particularly applicable among teams that have worked together for longer periods of time (15 months or more).

These findings have indicated that teams whose members have all (or nearly all) received team training either utilize different communication and coordination practices or distribute their work load differently than teams who have fewer members who have received training. Analyses presented below will address the question of whether these differences in style of functioning have any important consequences for achievement of team objectives.

RELATIONSHIP OF STYLE OF FUNCTIONING TO ACCOMPLISHMENT OF TEAM OBJECTIVES

Accomplishment of team objectives was considered from two perspectives: indices concerning the nature of team member and client interaction, and team accomplishment in the delivery of services as reflected by its monthly caseload status reports. Findings regarding the relationships between the two style of functioning variables (DF and its components and JP-S) and each of these two types of accomplishment criteria will be presented in the sections that follow.

INDICES OF TEAM INTERACTION AS CRITERIA OF ACCOMPLISHMENT OF TEAM OBJECTIVES

A major objective of the WIN team is to provide individualized employability development services as envisioned by the WIN team model. This model assumes that effective delivery of individualized services of this type requires closely coordinated planning and decision making involving both the different members of the team and the client. It was assumed in the present research that the extent to which a team had accomplished closely coordinated planning and decision making would be reflected in two ways: (a) the clarity of role communication among team members regarding each others' involvement in providing the various services, and (b) the relative extent to which the various members of the team and the client are involved in client-oriented decision making.

Clarity of role communication for each team will be represented in this analysis by three interrelated indices: summary percent agreement (S%A), summary percent disagreement (S%D), and summary percent ambiguity or uncertainty (S%U). These three summary scores can vary from 0 to 13; these score values reflect the number of caseload service areas for which a given team's average percent agreement scores were in the upper one-half of the distribution for the 50 teams. Thus, a score of 13 means that this team's average percent agreement (or average percent disagreement, average percent ambiguity) was high (upper one-half of the distribution) on all 13 caseload service areas. Conversely, a S%A score of 0 means that the team's average percent agreement was low (lower one-half of the distribution) for all 13 caseload service areas.

The relative involvement or spread of decision-making importance among members of a given team is reflected by a summary score labeled team member decision-making importance (Tm-DMI); the team's involvement of the client by a client decision-making importance (Cl-DMI) score. In interpreting these scores, a high score indicates high concentration of decision-making importance in one dominant decision maker and a low score, a leveling or spread of decision-making importance among team members and, as appropriate, the client. Each of these two scores can vary from 0 to 9 and were derived in a manner similar to that described for the clarity of role communication scores. Thus, a score of 9 shows that this team tends to concentrate decision-making importance in one dominant (team member) decision-maker in all nine caseload decision areas as regards either the other team members (Tm-DMI) or the client (Cl-DMI). Conversely, a score of 0 indicates that this team tends to level or spread decision-making importance among its team members (Tm-DMI) or the client (Cl-DMI) in each of the nine caseload decision areas.

The procedures followed in the derivation of the foregoing team interaction scores have been described in Chapter 2. Dichotomization of the distributions of these scores for the present analyses is described in Table 3-3.

FINDINGS ON TEAM INTERACTION AS A CRITERION

Style of Decision Functioning and Accomplishment of Team Interaction Objectives

A summary of the 2 × 2 contingency tables computed to study the relationship between style of decision functioning scores and the two types of team interaction criteria is presented in Table 3-17. This table indicates that teams who appear to emulate the team-process model of decision functioning (high DF scores) fare no better in achieving team interaction objectives than do teams whose style of functioning places less emphasis upon team member communication, coordination, and interaction with the client (low DF: specialist-process model).

As shown in Table 3-9, in-service WIN training did appear to influence teams toward the team-process model of decision functioning. The objectives of this model are to achieve closer communication and coordination among team members and between team members and the client during planning and the decision-making process. The high DF teams in Table 3-17 do not show evidence of the greater clarity of role communication that would be expected if their style of functioning were actually more effective in producing closely coordinated planning and decision making than the contrasting style of

Table 3-17

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Decision Functioning Scores That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Style of Decision Functioning (DF) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low DF (N=27)	High DF (N=23)	N	Low DF (N=13)	High DF (N=18)	N	Low DF (N=14)	High DF (N=5)
High S%A	26	48	56	18	62	56	8	36	60
High S%D	26	56	48	18	69	50	8	43	40
High S%U	27	56	52	14	38	50	13	71	60
High Tm-DMI	22	48	39	16	54	50	6	43	0
High Cl-DMI	24	52	43	16	62	44	8	43	40

functioning of the low DF teams. There is also no evidence in Table 3-17 that the style of functioning of the high DF teams resulted in greater involvement of team members and clients in client-oriented decision-making than was true of the low DF teams.

Tables 3-18 through 3-21 summarize the 2 × 2 contingency tables computed to explore the relationships between each of the four DF score components and the team interaction criteria. It was concluded that none of the four DF components showed a significant relationship with the criteria of accomplishment of team interaction objectives.

Table 3-18

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Decision Timing Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variables	Decision Timing Scores (dt) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low dt (N=19)	High dt (N=31)	N	Low dt (N=12)	High dt (N=19)	N	Low dt (N=7)	High dt (N=12)
High S%A	26	63	45	18	67	53	8	57	33
High S%D	26	53	52	18	67	53	8	28	50
High S%U	27	53	55	14	42	47	13	71	67
High Tm-DMI	22	47	42	16	42	58	6	57	17
High Cl-DMI	24	42	52	16	50	53	8	28	50

Table 3-19

Percentage of Teams With and Without Initial Assignment Alternatives That Were in the High Category for Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Initial Assignment Alternatives (alt.) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Without (N=24)	With (N=26)	N	Without (N=11)	With (N=20)	N	Without (N=13)	With (N=6)
High S%A	26	58	46	18	73	50	8	46	33
High S%D	26	46	58	18	45	65	8	46	33
High S%U	27	42	65	14	18	60*a	13	62	83
High Tm-DMI	22	46	42	16	64	45	6	31	33
High Cl-DMI	24	54	42	16	54	50	8	54	17

$^{a}\chi^2$ (1 *df*)=3.46, *p*<10.

Table 3-20

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Member Contact Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variables	Team Member Contact Scores (mc) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low mc (N=21)	High mc (N=29)	N	Low mc (N=12)	High mc (N=19)	N	Low mc (N=9)	High mc (N=10)
High S%A	26	57	48	18	67	53	8	44	40
High S%D	26	52	52	18	67	53	8	33	50
High S%U	27	57	52	14	42	47	13	78	60
High Tm-DMI	22	43	45	16	42	58	6	44	20
High Cl-CMI	24	43	52	16	50	53	8	33	50

Table 3-21

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Conference Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variables	Team Conference Scores (tc) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low tc (N=29)	High tc (N=21)	N	Low tc (N=15)	High tc (N=16)	N	Low tc (N=14)	High tc (N=6)
High S%A	26	48	57	18	53	62	8	43	40
High S%D	26	59	43	18	73	44	8	43	40
High S%U	27	59	48	14	47	44	13	71	60
High Tm-DMI	22	52	33	16	60	44	6	43	0
High Cl-DMI	24	52	43	16	67	38	8	36	60

Style of Functioning in Division of Labor and Accomplishment of Team Interaction Objectives

A summary of the 2 × 2 tables used to study the relationship between job position specialization (JP-S) scores and the two types of team interaction criteria is presented in Table 3-22. The data in this table indicate that teams that tend to divide their duties on the basis of job position specialties, thus minimizing overlap between different job positions (High JP-S), are predominantly teams that also had high role disagreement scores (S%D). The numerical trends for the remainder of the data in Table 3-22 suggest a consistent pattern of negative relationships between high job specialization style and accomplishment of team interaction objectives; however, this trend is not sufficiently pronounced to provide statistical support necessary to generalize from these observations.

Table 3-22

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in the High Category for Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Extent of Job Position Specialization (JP-S) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low JP-S (N=25)	High JP-S (N=25)	N	Low JP-S (N=19)	High JP-S (N=12)	N	Low JP-S (N=6)	High JP-S (N=13)
High S%A	26	64	40	18	63	50	8	67	31
High S%D	26	36	68^{**a}	18	42	83^{*b}	8	17	54
High S%U	27	40	68^{*c}	14	37	58	13	50	77
High Tm-DMI	22	36	52	16	37	75^{*d}	6	33	31
High Cl-DMI	24	36	60	16	37	75^{*d}	8	33	46

$^a\chi^2$ (1 *df*)=3.92, $p<.05$.
$^b\chi^2$ (1 *df*)=3.58, $p<.10$.
$^c\chi^2$ (1 *df*)=2.89, $p<.10$.
$^d\chi^2$ (1 *df*)=2.89, $p<.10$.

SUMMARY: STYLE OF FUNCTIONING AND ACCOMPLISHMENT OF TEAM INTERACTION OBJECTIVES

(1) The WIN team concept assumes that effective employability planning and decision making require the coordinated efforts of the entire team. Practices generally recommended to assist in accomplishing these objectives have included management of the decision making process so that several or all of the teams' members have contact with the enrollee prior to decision making, and the use of team conferences so as to draw upon the resources of the full team.

Present findings indicate that teams that follow these practices fare no better in achieving the close communication and coordination objectives of the team concept than do teams who do not follow these practices. Teams that use team conferences regularly exhibit as much disagreement and uncertainty regarding fellow team members' roles in providing caseload services as do teams that do not hold team conferences. Teams that use team conferences do not involve their various team members or the client in decision making to any greater extent than do teams that operate without team conferences.

Thus, the team practices generally recommended for achieving better communication and coordination among team members, and presumably, more effective assistance to the client, may provide a reasonable vehicle; however, there is no evidence that the objectives of these practices are being realized.

(2) The manner in which teams distribute work load among the various job position specialties represented on the team is related to achievement of communication and coordination objectives. Teams that tend to compartmentalize their work load distribution in terms of job position specialties are teams that show evidence of greater conflict and disagreement regarding "who does what" as compared with teams with deemphasize job position specialties and involve team members in a broader range of employability development activities. Numerical trends also suggest that these latter teams tend to involve their team members and the client to a greater extent in decision making than is the case with the teams that compartmentalize job activities in terms of job position

specialties. The deemphasis of job position specialties is, as indicated, a difference in degree. It does not produce marked changes in the general job position descriptions for the five team member positions.

It is concluded that increased effectiveness of coordination and communication among team members is achieved through the broader involvement of team members in all phases of team activities and is not dependent upon use of the more formal practices, such as team conferences.

Considered separately, training is more important than team experience in accomplishing team coordination and communication objectives. However, it currently takes both training of all team members and the longer periods of experience in working together to achieve the broader involvement of team members in all phases of the teams' activities. As will be seen in the findings to be presented next, this type of work load distribution appears to have important consequences, not only for achievement of communication and coordination objectives, but also for achievement of successful program outcome for enrollees.

MONTHLY CASELOAD STATUS REPORTS AS CRITERIA OF ACCOMPLISHMENT OF TEAM OBJECTIVES

Information regarding a team's monthly enrollment, terminations, and distribution of their current enrollees by program component was obtained from the monthly summary reports distributed by OMMDS, Department of Labor. In order to match WIN project statistics with a particular team, it was necessary for this analysis to discard teams from projects consisting of more than one office location. In addition, in the case of multi-team offices, it was necessary to assume that the caseload figures for the office, divided by the number of teams in the office, would provide an unbiased estimate of the caseload activity of the team in the sample.

Average monthly caseload figures were computed for teams based on a three-month period (1 October 1970 to 1 January 1971) chosen because it immediately preceded the study's data collection period. In addition, a placement rate (number successfully completing the Job Entry period as percent of total terminations) was computed for each team based on a six-month period (1 October 1970 to 1 April 1971). These indices were described in Chapter 2. Dichotomization of these indices for the present analysis is described in Table 3-3 for the reduced site-visit sample and in Table 3-6 for the reduced mail sample.

FINDINGS ON DELIVERY OF SERVICE AS A CRITERION

Style of Decision Functioning and Accomplishment of Caseload Services

Table 3-23 summarizes the 2 × 2 contingency tables computed to explore the relationship between style of decision functioning and caseload status variables for the site-visit teams. It will be noted that these analyses are based on 35 site-visit teams; it was not possible to match caseload statistics with the remaining 15 teams. The identical score cutting points used in dichotomizing variables presented previously in the analyses based on the full 50 teams were retained for use in the present analyses.

Table 3-23 does not show a relationship between style of decision functioning (DF scores) and teams' caseload status variables. The corresponding data for each of the four components of the DF score are summarized in Tables 24 through 27.

Table 3-23

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Style of Decision Functioning Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample[a]

Variable	Style of Decision Functioning (DF) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low DF (N=16)	High DF (N=19)	N	Low DF (N=6)	High DF (N=14)	N	Low DF (N=10)	High DF (N=5)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	38	63	12	50	64	6	30	60
Average Caseload	17	38	58	9	33	50	8	40	80
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	56	42	11	67	50	6	50	20
% Vol.–O & A	17	50	47	7	33	36	10	60	80
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	56	42	9	50	43	8	60	40
% Vol.–General Hold	17	62	37	8	67	29	9	60	60
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	38	58	11	33	64	6	40	40
% Vol.–In Job Entry	17	38	58	10	33	57	7	40	60
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	50	53	9	67	36	9	40	100^{*b}
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	44	47	12	67	57	4	30	20
% Vol.–Suspense	17	50	47	10	67	43	7	40	60

[a] Derived from monthly project summaries.

[b] Fisher Exact Probability Test (two-tailed), $p<.10$.

Table 3-24

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Decision Timing Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Time Phasing of Decisions (dt) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low dt (N=10)	High dt (N=25)	N	Low dt (N=4)	High dt (N=16)	N	Low dt (N=6)	High dt (N=9)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	30	60	12	50	62	6	17	56
Average Caseload	17	20	60^{*a}	9	25	50	8	17	78^{*b}
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	50	48	11	75	50	6	33	44
% Vol.–O & A	17	40	52	7	25	38	10	50	78
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	60	44	9	50	44	8	67	44
% Vol.–General Hold	17	60	44	8	50	38	9	67	56
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	30	56	11	25	62	6	33	44
% Vol.–In Job Entry	17	20	60^{*a}	10	25	56	7	17	67
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	60	48	9	75	38	9	50	67
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	40	48	12	75	56	4	17	33
% Vol.–Suspense	17	60	44	10	75	44	7	50	44

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*)=3.11, $p<.10$.

[b] Fisher Exact Probability Test (two-tailed), $p<.10$.

Table 3-25

Percentage of Teams With and Without Initial Assignment Alternatives That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Initial Assignment Alternatives (Alt.) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Without (N=19)	With (N=16)	N	Without (N=6)	With (N=12)	N	Without (N=11)	With (N=4)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	74	25**[a]	12	100	33**[b]	6	55	00
Average Caseload	17	58	38	9	50	42	8	64	25
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	21	81**[c]	11	00	92**[d]	6	36	50
% Vol.–O & A	17	68	25**[e]	7	50	25	10	82	25
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	68	25**[e]	9	88	17**[d]	8	55	50
% Vol.–General Hold	17	42	56	8	25	50	9	55	75
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	63	31	11	75	42	6	55	00
% Vol.–In Job Entry	17	63	31	10	75	33	7	55	25
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	47	56	9	25	58	9	64	50
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	53	38	12	75	50	4	36	00
% Vol.–Suspense	17	42	56	10	38	58	7	45	50

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*)=6.40, $p<.02$.
[b] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p<.02$.
[c] χ^2 (1 *df*)=10.30, $p<.01$.
[d] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p<.01$.
[e] χ^2 (1 *df*)=4.93, $p<.05$.

Table 3-26

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Member Contact Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Team Member Contact Scores (mc) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low mc (N=12)	High mc (N=23)	N	Low mc (N=4)	High mc (N=16)	N	Low mc (N=8)	High mc (N=7)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	33	61	12	50	62	6	25	57
Average Caseload	17	25	61*[a]	9	25	50	8	25	86*[b]
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	50	48	11	75	50	6	38	43
% Vol.–O & A	17	42	52	7	25	38	10	50	86
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	58	43	9	50	44	8	62	43
% Vol.–General Hold	17	50	48	8	50	38	9	50	71
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	33	57	11	25	62	6	38	43
% Vol.–In Job Entry	17	42	57	10	25	56	7	50	57
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	58	48	9	75	38	9	50	71
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	42	48	12	75	56	4	25	29
% Vol.–Suspense	17	58	43	10	75	44	7	50	43

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*)=2.75, $p<.10$.
[b] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p<.10$.

Table 3-27

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Conference Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Team Conference Scores								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low tc (N=18)	High tc (N=17)	N	Low tc (N=8)	High tc (N=12)	N	Low tc (N=10)	High tc (N=5)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	33	71*[a]	12	50	67	6	20	80*[b]
Average Caseload	17	44	53	9	50	42	8	40	80
% Vol.—Initial Hold	17	56	41	11	75	42	6	40	40
% Vol.—O & A	17	44	53	7	25	42	10	60	80
% Vol.—WIN Training	17	50	47	9	38	50	8	60	40
% Vol.—General Hold	17	67	29*[a]	8	62	25	9	70	40
% Vol.—Completed Training	17	39	59	11	50	58	6	30	60
% Vol.—In Job Entry	17	33	65	10	38	58	7	30	80
% Vol.—Abort Program	18	56	47	9	75	25*[b]	9	40	100*[b]
% Vol.—Completed Job Entry	16	39	53	12	62	58	4	20	40
% Vol.—Suspense	17	56	41	10	62	42	7	50	40

[a] $\chi^2(1df) = 3.48, p < .10$.

[b] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

All but Table 3-25 are consistent with the results shown for the total DF score. That table deals with the presence or absence of decision or action alternatives at initial assignment (alt.) and the relationship of this dichotomy to the caseload status variables. The interview data indicated that teams in this sample that did not have alternatives at initial assignment routinely referred all new not-job-ready enrollees to WIN Orientation. Teams that did have initial assignment alternatives referred the not-job-ready either to Orientation or to work or training components. Thus, the basic dichotomy is the routine use of orientation for the initial assignment of those considered not-job-ready vs. use of a wider range of initial assignments for these individuals. Dichotomized this way, this is the one component of the DF score that shows no relationship to the total DF score.

Presence or absence of initial assignment alternatives shows some interesting relationships with the caseload status variables. Teams that routinely referred the not-job-ready to orientation (without alternatives) were predominantly those with the higher success or job placement rates (six-month base: 25—60% of all terminations). According to the data in Table 3-25, teams that routinely used orientation as the initial assignment also had a lower percentage of their caseload in initial hold than teams that used initial assignment alternatives. As might be expected, teams that routinely used orientation as the initial assignment had a higher percentage of enrollees in the orientation and assessment component than teams that used initial assignment alternatives. Finally, teams without initial assignment alternatives had a higher proportion of their caseloads enrolled in WIN training components.

Use of decision or action alternatives at enrollment and/or initial assignment was introduced into the scoring of style of decision functioning because of its implications regarding flexibility of planning to meet individual enrollee's needs. While teams were scored for use or nonuse of alternatives at enrollment, the interview data regarding conditions under which alternatives were used or not used (i.e., referrals for enrollment accepted or rejected as inappropriate) were too unclear to permit interpretation of team differences in this respect.

The interview data provided a relatively clear base for interpreting presence or absence of initial assignment alternatives for the not-job-ready. Absence of alternatives meant routine assignment to orientation; this interpretation is supported by the figures in Table 3-25 showing those teams without initial assignment alternatives as having a higher percentage of their caseloads in orientation. If the team's caseload is comprised primarily of the not-job-ready; if they conduct and schedule orientation so it is responsive to enrollment input; and if new enrollees are routinely assigned to orientation, it would be expected that these teams would have a relatively low percentage of their enrollees in Initial Hold status. Table 3-25 indicates that teams without initial assignment alternatives had a lower percentage of their caseload in Initial Hold than teams that used initial assignment alternatives.

It is tempting to conclude that routine referral of the not-job-ready to orientation produced a number of benefits that led to better use of WIN training and culminated in a higher percentage of enrollees terminating following successful completion of the three-month job entry period. However, fragmentary data on use of initial assignment alternatives and labor area unemployment rates suggest that use of initial assignment alternatives may be a regular practice or even requirement in areas of high unemployment but not in areas of relatively low unemployment. Unemployment data were not available for all office locations.

Using the Department of Labor area trends publication, it was possible to identify unemployment rates (as of August 1970) for 24 of the 35 teams presented in Table 3-25 (13). Unemployment rates were dichotomized into high (> 5.4%) and low (< 5.4%) based on the nearest midpoint of the distribution for the 24 teams. Of the 19 teams that did not use initial assignment alternatives, area unemployment data were available on 16; of the 16 teams that did use initial assignment alternatives, on only 8 (Table 3-25). Recognizing that bias might occur because of the missing data, it is still interesting to note that only four of the 16 teams that functioned without initial assignment alternatives were from high unemployment areas, compared to seven of the eight teams that did use initial assignment alternatives.

In summary, routine referral to orientation may well produce a number of benefits leading to more successful program outcome for the team's enrollees. However, it is likely that a significant part of this apparent success lies in the tendency for teams to routinely use orientation and place more emphasis upon employability training when located in areas with favorable employment opportunities; when located in areas of relatively high unemployment, teams tend to make initial assignments directly to work and training components.

Style of Division of Labor and Accomplishment of Program Services

Table 3-28 summarizes the 2 × 2 contingency tables computed to study the relationship between the teams' practice of job position specialization and indices reflecting accomplishment of caseload services. This table suggests, for the site-visit sample, a negative relationship between job position specialization and successful terminations or placement rate. The trend was consistent for both single and multi-team offices but is statistically significant only when teams from both kinds of offices are pooled.

Thus, in the site-visit sample there is some evidence that enrollees of teams whose style of functioning deemphasizes job position specialization had greater success in completing the program. The site-visit teams' job position specialization scores were studied for each of the Job Activity Inventory duty areas in order to see whether this

Table 3-28

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Extent of Job Position Specialization (JP-S) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low JP-S (N=16)	High JP-S (N=19)	N	Low JP-S (N=12)	High JP-S (N=8)	N	Low JP-S (N=4)	High JP-S (N=11)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	75	32**a	12	75	38	6	75	27
Average Caseload	17	56	42	9	58	25	8	50	55
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	44	53	11	50	62	6	25	45
% Vol.–O & A	17	38	58	7	17	62	10	100	55
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	56	42	9	50	38	8	75	45
% Vol.–General Hold	17	50	47	8	50	25	9	50	64
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	50	47	11	50	62	6	50	36
% Vol.–Job Entry	17	50	47	10	42	62	7	75	36
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	38	63	9	42	50	9	25	73
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	69	26**b	12	75	38	4	50	18
% Vol.–Suspense	17	38	58	10	42	62	7	25	55

${}^{a}\chi^2 (1\ df) = 4.93, p < .05$
${}^{b}\chi^2 (1\ df) = 4.71, p < .05$

relationship was more dependent upon specialization in certain areas than in others. Contingency tables (2 × 2) were computed comparing teams' high and low specialization scores for each duty area with their high and low classification on the six-month placement rate variable and the percentage of their average monthly caseload completing job entry. Relationships significant beyond the .10 level were identified with job position specialization in three duty areas: accomplishes initial assignment of enrollee (Duty Area 3); assists enrollee in obtaining needed services and supervises his program during enrollment (Duty Area 5); and conducts determinations in case of applicant/enrollee referred for determination decision (Duty Area 6).

Job position specialization in Duty Area 3 was most frequently identified with the counselor. Teams from the site-visit sample with high job position specialization in this duty area were predominantly those with low six-month placement rates (χ^2, 1 df=3.43; $p < .10$).

Job position specialization in Duty Area 5, monitoring the enrollee during the period of enrollment, was most frequently identified with the coach. Site-visit teams with high job position specialization in this area were predominantly teams with low six-month placement rates (χ^2, 1 df=8.24; $p < .01$) as well as teams with a low percentage of average monthly caseload completing the job entry period (χ^2, 1 df=4.93; $p < .05$).

Job position specialization in Duty Area 6 (the administrative process of terminating enrollees for reasons other than successful program completion) was not as consistently identified with a particular job position as are Duty Areas 3 and 5. As noted earlier in this report, counselors and coaches were the most consistently staffed positions and, possibly because of this, were identified with job position specialization in this duty area with about equal frequency. Teams with high job position specialization in this area were predominantly teams with low six-month placement rates (χ^2, 1 df=4.82; $p < .05$).

Table 3-29 presents corresponding data for the mail sample. In this case, job position specialization does not relate either to the six-month placement rate or to percentage of the average monthly caseload completing job entry. For the mail sample, job position specialization relates negatively to percentage of average caseload in orientation and assessment.

The job position specialization scores for each duty area for the mail sample show that teams with high job position specialization in Duty Area 3 (accomplishes initial assignment of enrollee) were predominantly teams with a low percentage of their average monthly caseload in orientation and assessment (χ^2, 1 df=4.59; $p<.05$).

Table 3-29

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Job Position Specialization Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample

Variable	Extent of Job Position Specialization (JP-S) (%)								
	All Mail Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low JP-S (N=18)	High JP-S (N=19)	N	Low JP-S (N=12)	High JP-S (N=13)	N	Low JP-S (N=6)	High JP-S (N=6)
6-Month Placement Rate	19	56	47	13	58	46	6	50	50
Average Caseload	18	56	42	12	42	54	6	83	17*[a]
% Vol.–Initial Hold	18	44	53	13	50	54	5	33	50
% Vol.–O & A	19	72	32**[b]	14	75	38	5	67	17
% Vol.–WIN Training	18	61	37	12	58	38	6	67	33
% Vol.–General Hold	18	33	63	10	25	54	8	50	83
% Vol.–Completed Training	18	33	63	15	42	77	3	17	33
% Vol.–In Job Entry	18	44	53	14	58	54	4	17	50
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	50	47	12	50	46	6	50	50
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	18	39	58	13	42	62	5	50	50
% Vol.–Suspense	18	44	53	10	33	46	8	67	67

[a] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p<.10$.

[b] χ^2 (1 *df*)=4.59, $p<.05$.

SUMMARY: STYLE OF FUNCTIONING AND ACCOMPLISHMENT OF CASELOAD SERVICES

(1) Practices generally considered important to achievement of team objectives have included management of the decision-making process so that several or all of the teams' members have contact with the enrollee prior to decision-making, and the use of team conferences so that the resources of the full team are drawn upon during planning and decision-making. As summarized in the preceding section, use of these practices does not result in better communication and coordination among team members nor in greater involvement of team members and client in decision-making. Results of the present analyses suggest that use of these practices, in general, does not improve the enrollees' chances for successful program termination.

There is one specific exception to this general finding, however; this exception deals with the teams' initial assignment practices. Based on partial data, it appears that teams located in areas of relatively low unemployment routinely refer enrollees considered not-job-ready to WIN Orientation and use this period of enrollment to interact with them in developing employability goals. Enrollees of these teams achieve relatively high rates of successful program terminations (25 to 60%). In contrast, teams located in areas of relatively high unemployment do not routinely refer the not-job-ready to WIN Orientation and instead tend to make initial assignments directly to work or training components. Since this is generally done on the basis of one or two contacts with the enrollee, it means that tentative employability plans and goals have been identified with very little interaction between the enrollee and the team. Enrollees of these teams have relatively low rates of successful program completion (fewer than 25% of all terminations).

Conclusions drawn from these data have to be approached with caution; there is a modest, but general relationship between successful termination rates and unemployment rates for the corresponding labor area.[1] However, if it is generally true that teams in areas of relatively high unemployment skip over the effort of working out employability plans with their enrollees, it does not seem likely that the assignments to work and training components would lead to job placements.

Thus, these findings raise a question regarding the extent to which the lower rates of program success in areas of high unemployment are simply due to lack of available jobs, or are due to lack of team effort in working with enrollees to develop acceptable employability plans.

(2) As stated earlier, distribution of work load which deemphasizes job position specialties leads to better communication and coordination among team members than does more rigid separation among team member specialties. Effective communication and coordination of effort is assumed to be essential to the accomplishment of successful employability planning and decision making.

Present findings indicate that this deemphasis of job position specialties also results in higher rates of successful program completion for the teams' enrollees. To repeat—this deemphasis does not eliminate the identifying features of the various job position specialties; the difference between these teams and those that maintain more right compartmentalization is a matter of degree, but it clearly has importance. It seems likely that the greater range of team member participation in team work activities gives the members a better understanding of the enrollee; because of mutual work experiences they have a better basis for communicating with each other, and a stronger identification with the team and its objectives than with an individual job specialty.

SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES

A series of supplementary analyses were carried out to assist in interpretation of findings reported in the preceding sections. A few of these relationships appear to have their own separate implications. These are abstracted in the following paragraphs, with tables on these analyses included for the reader who may desire further information.

---

[1] It was possible to match WIN projects with 109 of the 150 major labor areas identified in Department of Labor *Area Trends* publication. Using corresponding data periods, a Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was computed relating successful program completion rates to the unemployment rate for the respective area. This resulting coefficient indicated a modest association between high unemployment and low program success rates ($r=-.21$; $p<.05$).

RELATIONSHIP OF TEAM EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND STAFFING TO TEAM INTERACTION

These analyses are presented in Tables 3-30 through 3-36. Notable findings from these tables are as follows:

(1) Coordination among team members appears to be improved as a result of team training—if all or nearly all members of the team have received the training. Under these conditions there is less uncertainty or ambiguity expressed regarding the nature of each others' involvement in providing services than when two or more members of the team have not received training (Table 3-34).

(2) Coordination and communication among team members is least effective among teams staffed with the full basic staffing pattern (coach, counselor, job developer, work-training specialist, and clerk). These teams exhibit greater conflict and disagreement among team members than do teams whose staffing omits one or more of these job positions (Table 3-35).

Table 3-30

Percentage of Teams From Offices With High and Low Duration of WIN Experience That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Samples

Variable	Office Experience (OE) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low OE (N=26)	High OE (N=24)	N	Low OE (N=22)	High OE (N=9)	N	Low OE (N=4)	High OE (N=15)
High S%A	26	54	50	18	64	44	8	0	53
High S%D	26	50	54	18	54	67	8	25	47
High S%U	27	50	58	14	45	44	13	75	67
High Tm-DMI	22	54	33	16	59	33	6	25	33
High Cl-DMI	24	50	46	16	54	44	8	25	47

Table 3-31

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Average Team Member Experience That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Team Member Experience (TE) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low TE (N=25)	High TE (N=25)	N	Low TE (N=16)	High TE (N=15)	N	Low TE (N=9)	High TE (N=10)
High S%A	26	56	48	18	69	47	8	33	50
High S%D	26	64	40	18	69	47	8	56	30
High S%U	27	68	40*[a]	14	56	33	13	89	50
High Tm-DMI	22	48	40	16	62	40	6	22	40
High Cl-DMI	24	60	36	16	69	33	8	44	40

[a] χ^2 (1 df) = 2.89, $p < .10$

Table 3-32

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Experienced Team Leaders That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Team Leader Experience (LE) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low LE (N=25)	High LE (N=25)	N	Low LE (N=15)	High LE (N=16)	N	Low LE (N=10)	High LE (N=9)
High S%A	26	56	48	18	60	56	8	50	33
High S%D	26	60	44	18	73	44	8	40	44
High S%U	27	68	40*[a]	14	67	25**[b]	13	70	67
High Tm-DMI	22	48	40	16	67	38	6	20	44
High Cl-DMI	24	56	40	16	67	38	8	40	44

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*)=2.89, $p<.10$.

[b] χ^2 (1 *df*)=3.87, $p<.05$.

Table 3-33

Percentage of Teams Having High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Prior Employment Service Experience That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Prior Employment Service Experience (P-ES) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low P-ES (N=21)	High P-ES (N=29)	N	Low P-ES (N=15)	High P-ES (N=16)	N	Low P-ES (N=6)	High P-ES (N=13)
High S%A	26	67	41	18	67	50	8	67	31
High S%D	26	38	62	18	33	81**[a]	8	50	38
High S%U	27	38	66	14	40	50	13	33	85*[b]
High Tm-DMI	22	28	55	16	27	75**[c]	6	33	31
High Cl-DMI	24	38	55	16	33	69	8	50	38

[a] χ^2 (I *df*) = 5.46, $p<.02$.

[b] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p<.10$.

[c] χ^2 (I *df*) = 5.43, $p<.02$.

Table 3-34

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Inservice Team Training That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Team Training (TT) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low TT (N=26)	High TT (N=24)	N	Low TT (N=11)	High TT (N=20)	N	Low TT (N=15)	High TT (N=4)
High S%A	26	50	54	18	64	55	8	40	50
High S%D	26	50	54	18	73	50	8	33	75
High S%U	27	69	38^{**a}	14	64	35	13	73	50
High Tm-DMI	22	46	42	16	73	40	6	27	50
High Cl-DMI	24	62	33	16	82	35^{*b}	8	47	25

$^{a}\chi^2$ (1 *df*)=3.86, $p < .05$.
$^{b}\chi^2$ (1 *df*)=2.92, $p < .10$.

Table 3-35

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Staffing Pattern That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Staffing Pattern (SP) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low SP (N=30)	High SP (N=20)	N	Low SP (N=17)	High SP (N=14)	N	Low SP (N=13)	High SP (N=6)
High S%A	26	57	45	18	59	57	8	54	17
High S%D	26	37	75^{**a}	18	41	78^{*b}	8	31	67
High S%U	27	43	70	14	29	64	13	62	83
High Tm-DMI	22	43	45	16	41	64	6	46	00
High Cl-DMI	24	37	65	16	41	64	8	31	67

$^{a}\chi^2$ (1 *df*)=5.61, $p < .02$.
$^{b}\chi^2$ (1 *df*)=3.00, $p < .10$.

Table 3-36

Percentage of Teams Staffed With High and Low Number of Team Members That Were High on Team Interaction Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Number of Team Members (TR) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low TR (N=32)	High TR (N=18)	N	Low TR (N=18)	High TR (N=13)	N	Low TR (N=14)	High TR (N=5)
High S%A	26	47	61	18	56	62	8	36	60
High S%D	26	41	72	18	44	77	8	36	60
High S%U	27	53	56	14	39	54	13	71	60
High-Tm-DMI	22	38	56	16	50	54	6	21	60
High Cl-DMI	24	50	44	16	50	54	8	50	20

RELATIONSHIP OF TEAM CHARACTERISTICS TO ACCOMPLISHMENT OF CASELOAD SERVICES

These analyses are presented in Tables 3-37 through 3-49. It was concluded from these analyses that team experience, training, and staffing variables do not show any interpretable pattern of relationships with teams' caseload status variables.

RELATIONSHIP OF TEAM INTERACTION TO ACCOMPLISHMENT OF CASELOAD SERVICES

These analyses are presented in Tables 3-50 through 3-54, which indicate scattered trends but no clear relationships between effectiveness of team member interaction and involvement of the client and the program status of the teams' clients.

The various analyses carried out on the teams' monthly caseload status summaries lead to the conclusion that these figures, describing distribution of current enrollment, do not provide useful indices of the teams' accomplishment of caseload services. There appear to be too many unknown factors that affect distribution of enrollees over the various active and "hold" components to permit interpretation of differences among teams. Some of the major sources of confusion relate not to team performance, but to shifts in state and local policies regarding, for example, regulation of enrollment, categories to be used in reporting status of seasonal workers temporarily on AFDC rolls, and availability of welfare monies for child care. Thus, it is concluded that figures concerning the number of successful program terminations currently provide the only useful index of accomplishment of program services.

Table 3-37

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Office Experience That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Office Experience (OE) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low OE (N=19)	High OE (N=16)	N	Low OE (N=16)	High OE (N=4)	N	Low OE (N=3)	High OE (N=12)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	58	44	12	62	50	6	33	42
Average Caseload	17	37	62	9	38	75	8	33	58
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	53	44	11	50	75	6	67	33
% Vol.–O & A	17	42	56	7	38	25	10	67	67
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	53	44	9	50	25	8	67	50
% Vol.–General Hold	17	42	56	8	38	50	9	67	58
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	47	50	11	50	75	6	33	42
% Vol.–Job Entry	17	47	50	10	44	75	7	67	42
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	32	75**[a]	9	38	75	9	00	75*[b]
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	58	31	12	62	50	4	33	25
% Vol.–Suspense	17	47	50	10	44	75	7	67	42

[a] χ^2 (1df) = 4.93, $p < .05$.

[b] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

Table 3-38

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Average Team Member Experience That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Team Member Experience (TE) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low TE (N=16)	High TE (N=19)	N	Low TE (N=9)	High TE (N=11)	N	Low TE (N=7)	High TE (N=8)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	50	53	12	56	64	6	43	38
Average Caseload	17	50	47	9	33	55	8	71	38
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	50	47	11	44	64	6	57	25
% Vol. O & A	17	69	32^{**a}	7	67	9^{**b}	10	71	62
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	56	42	9	56	36	8	57	50
% Vol.–General Hold	17	38	58	11	33	45	9	43	75
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	38	58	11	33	73	6	43	38
% Vol.–In Job Entry	17	50	47	10	33	64	7	71	25
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	50	53	9	33	55	9	71	50
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	38	53	12	44	73	4	29	25
% Vol.–Suspense	17	44	53	10	44	55	7	43	50

[a] χ^2 (1 df) = 3.43, $p < .10$.

[b] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

Table 3-39

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Experienced Team Leaders That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Team Leader Experience (LE) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low LE (N=17)	High LE (N=18)	N	Low LE (N=9)	High LE (N=11)	N	Low LE (N=8)	High LE (N=7)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	53	50	12	56	64	6	50	29
Average Caseload	17	59	39	9	44	45	8	75	29
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	53	44	11	67	45	6	38	43
% Vol.–O & A	17	47	50	7	33	36	10	62	71
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	41	56	9	33	55	8	50	57
% Vol.–General Hold	17	47	50	8	44	36	9	50	71
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	41	56	11	33	73	6	50	29
% Vol.–In Job Entry	17	41	56	10	22	73^{*a}	7	62	29
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	53	50	9	33	55	9	75	43
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	41	50	12	44	73	4	38	14
% Vol.–Suspense	17	47	50	10	44	55	7	50	43

[a] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

Table 3-40

Percentage of Teams Having High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Prior Employment Service Experience That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Prior Employment Service Experience (P-ES) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low P-ES (N=14)	High P-ES (N=21)	N	Low P-ES (N=8)	High P-ES (N=12)	N	Low P-ES (N=6)	High P-ES (N=9)
6 Month Placement Rate	18	57	48	12	50	67	6	67	22
Average Caseload	17	36	57	9	25	58	8	50	56
% Vol.—Initial Hold	17	43	52	11	50	58	6	33	44
% Vol.—O & A	17	57	43	7	38	33	10	83	56
% Vol.—WIN Training	17	50	48	9	50	42	8	50	56
% Vol.—General Hold	17	43	52	8	38	42	9	50	67
% Vol.—Completed Training	17	50	48	11	50	58	6	50	67
% Vol.—In Job Entry	17	50	48	10	50	50	7	50	44
% Vol.—Abort Program	18	50	52	9	25	58	9	83	44
% Vol.—Completed Job Entry	16	50	43	12	62	58	4	33	22
% Vol.—Suspense	17	50	48	10	50	50	7	50	44

Table 3-41

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Inservice Team Training That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Team Training (TT) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low TT (N=16)	High TT (N=19)	N	Low TT (N=5)	High TT (N=15)	N	Low TT (N=11)	High TT (N=4)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	38	63	12	40	67	6	36	50
Average Caseload	17	38	58	9	40	47	8	37	100
%Vol.—Initial Hold	17	56	42	11	80	47	6	45	25
% Vol.—O &A	17	56	42	7	40	33	10	64	75
% Vol.—WIN Training	17	38	58	9	20	53	8	45	75
% Vol.—General Hold	17	56	42	8	60	33	9	55	75
% Vol.—Completed Training	17	38	58	11	40	60	6	36	50
% Vol.—In Job Entry	17	50	47	10	40	53	7	55	25
% Vol.—Abort Program	18	56	47	9	40	47	9	64	50
% Vol.—Completed Job Entry	16	31	58	12	60	60	4	18	50
% Vol.—Suspense	17	50	47	10	40	53	7	55	25

Table 3-42

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Staffing Pattern That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Staffing Pattern (SP) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low SP (N=21)	High SP (N=14)	N	Low SP (N=11)	High SP (N=9)	N	Low SP (N=10)	High SP (N=5)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	43	64	12	55	67	6	30	60
Average Caseload	17	38	64	9	27	67	8	50	60
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	38	64	11	45	67	6	30	60
% Vol.–O & A	17	57	36	7	45	22	10	70	60
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	52	43	9	55	33	8	50	60
% Vol.–General Hold	17	52	43	8	27	56	9	80	20**[a]
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	52	43	11	73	33	6	30	60
% Vol.–In Job Entry	17	48	50	10	73	22**[a]	7	20	100**[b]
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	48	57	9	36	56	9	60	60
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	38	57	12	64	56	4	10	60
% Vol.–Suspense	17	52	43	10	45	56	7	60	20

[a] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

[b] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .02$.

Table 3-43

Percentage of Teams Staffed With High and Low Number of Team Members That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Number of Team Members (TR) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low TR (N=20)	High TR (N=15)	N	Low TR (N=10)	High TR (N=10)	N	Low TR (N=10)	High TR (N=5)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	50	53	12	50	70	6	50	20
Average Caseload	17	55	40	9	40	50	8	70	20
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	45	53	11	50	60	6	40	40
% Vol.–O & A	17	55	40	7	40	30	10	70	60
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	45	53	9	50	40	8	40	80
% Vol.–General Hold	17	45	53	8	20	60	9	70	40
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	60	33	11	70	40	6	50	20
% Vol.–Job Entry	17	60	33	10	70	30	7	50	40
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	45	60	9	40	50	9	50	80
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	45	47	12	50	70	4	40	00
% Vol.–Suspense	17	45	53	10	40	60	7	50	40

Table 3-44

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Average Team Member Experience That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample

Variable	Team Member Experience (TE) (%)								
	All Mail Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low TE (N=18)	High TE (N=19)	N	Low TE (N=12)	High TE (N-13)	N	Low TE (N=6)	High TE (N=6)
6-Month Placement Rate	19	44	58	13	58	46	6	17	83*[a]
Average Caseload	18	50	47	12	50	46	6	50	50
% Vol.–Initial Hold	18	50	47	13	50	54	5	50	33
% Vol.–O & A	19	61	42	14	67	46	5	50	33
% Vol.–WIN Training	18	67	32*[b]	12	75	23**[c]	6	50	50
% Vol.–General Hold	18	44	53	10	33	46	8	67	67
% Vol.–Completed Training	18	39	58	15	42	77	3	33	17
% Vol.–Job Entry	18	33	63	14	33	77*[d]	4	33	33
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	44	53	12	33	62	6	67	33
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	18	56	42	13	58	46	5	50	33
% Vol.–Suspense	18	39	58	10	25	54	8	67	67

[a] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

[b] χ^2 (1 df) = 3.26, $p < .10$.

[c] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .05$.

[d] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

Table 3-45

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Experienced Team Leaders That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample

Variable	Team Leader Experience (LE) (%)								
	All Mail Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low LE (N=21)	High LE (N=16)	N	Low LE (N=15)	High LE (N=10)	N	Low LE (N=6)	High LE (N=6)
6-Month Placement Rate	19	52	50	13	67	30	6	17	83*[a]
Average Caseload	18	48	50	12	40	60	6	67	33
% Vol.–Initial Hold	18	43	56	13	40	70	5	50	33
% Vol.–O & A	19	67	31*[b]	14	73	30*[c]	5	50	33
% Vol.–WIN Training	18	57	38	12	60	30	6	50	50
% Vol.–General Hold	18	48	50	10	33	50	8	83	50
% Vol.–Completed Training	18	38	62	15	47	80	3	17	33
% Vol.–Job Entry	18	48	50	14	60	50	4	17	50
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	48	50	12	47	50	6	50	50
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	18	48	50	13	53	50	5	33	50
% Vol.–Suspense	18	43	56	10	33	50	8	67	67

[a] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

[b] χ^2 (1 df) = 3.25, $p < .10$.

[c] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

Table 3-46

Percentage of Teams Having High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Prior Employment Service Experience That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample

Variable	Prior Employment Service Experience (ES) (%)								
	All Mail Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low P-ES (N=22)	High P-ES (N=15)	N	Low P-ES (N=15)	High P-ES (N=10)	N	Low P-ES (N=7)	High P-ES (N=6)
6-Month Placement Rate	19	50	53	13	53	50	6	43	60
Average Caseload	18	55	40	12	53	40	6	57	40
% Vol.—Initial Hold	18	45	53	13	47	60	5	43	40
% Vol.—O & A	19	41	67	14	47	70	5	29	60
% Vol.—WIN Training	18	55	40	12	60	30	6	43	60
% Vol.—General Hold	18	45	53	10	40	40	8	57	80
% Vol.—Completed Training	18	64	27*[a]	15	73	40	3	43	00
% Vol.—Job Entry	18	55	40	14	60	50	4	43	20
% Vol.—Abort Program	18	45	53	12	33	70	6	71	20
% Vol.—Completed Job Entry	18	59	33	13	60	40	5	57	20
% Vol.—Suspense	18	50	47	10	40	40	8	71	60

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*) = 3.51, $p < .10$

Table 3-47

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Proportion of Team Members With Inservice Team Training That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample

Variable	Team Training (TT) (%)								
	All Mail Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low TT (N=23)	High TT (N=14)	N	Low TT (N=14)	High TT (N=11)	N	Low TT (N=9)	High TT (N=3)
6-Month Placement Rate	19	57	43	3	50	55	6	67	00
Average Caseload	18	57	36	12	57	36	6	56	33
% Vol.—Initial Hold	18	52	43	13	57	45	5	44	33
% Vol.—O & A	19	48	57	14	50	64	5	44	33
% Vol.—WIN Training	18	30	79**[a]	12	29	73*[b]	6	33	100
% Vol.—General Hold	18	61	29	10	57	18	8	67	67
% Vol.—Completed Training	18	48	50	15	57	64	3	33	00
% Vol.—Job Entry	18	57	36	14	64	45	4	44	00
% Vol.—Abort Program	18	39	64	12	43	55	6	33	100
% Vol.—Completed Job Entry	18	39	64	13	43	64	5	33	67
% Vol.—Suspense	18	48	50	10	36	45	8	67	67

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*) = 6.26, $p < .02$.

[b] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

Table 3-48

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Team Staffing Pattern That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample

Variable	Staffing Pattern (SP) (%)								
	All Mail Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low SP (N=29)	High SP (N=8)	N	Low SP (N=21)	High SP (N=4)	N	Low SP (N=8)	High SP (N=4)
6-Month Placement Rate	19	52	50	13	52	50	6	50	50
Average Caseload	18	48	50	12	52	25	6	38	75
% Vol.–Initial Hold	18	48	50	13	52	50	5	38	50
% Vol.–O & A	19	48	50	14	52	75	5	38	50
% Vol.–WIN Training	18	45	62	12	48	50	6	38	75
% Vol.–General Hold	18	55	25	10	48	00	8	75	50
% Vol.–Completed Training	18	48	50	15	57	75	3	25	25
% Vol.–Job Entry	18	52	38	14	57	50	4	38	25
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	45	62	12	48	50	6	38	75
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	18	48	50	13	52	50	5	38	50
% Vol.–Suspense	18	55	25	10	48	00	8	75	50

Table 3-49

Percentage of Teams Staffed With High and Low Number of Team Members That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Mail Sample

Variable	Number of Team Members (TR) (%)								
	All Mail Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low TR (N=23)	High TR (N=14)	N	Low TR (N=14)	High TR (N=11)	N	Low TR (N=9)	High TR (N=3)
6-Month Placement Rate	19	48	57	13	50	55	6	44	67
Average Caseload	18	39	64	12	36	64	6	44	67
% Vol.–Initial Hold	18	48	50	13	50	55	5	44	33
% Vol.–O & A	19	65	29*[a]	14	71	36	5	56	00
% Vol.–WIN Training	18	48	50	12	50	45	6	44	67
% Vol.–General Hold	18	61	29	10	50	27	8	78	33
% Vol.–Completed Training	18	35	71*[b]	15	36	91**[c]	3	33	00
% Vol.–Job Entry	18	39	64	14	36	82*[d]	4	44	00
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	48	50	12	50	45	6	44	67
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	18	43	57	13	57	45	5	22	100*[e]
% Vol.–Suspense	18	52	43	10	50	27	8	56	100

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*) = 3.33, $p < .10$.
[b] χ^2 (1 *df*) = 3.33, $p < .10$.
[c] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .05$.
[d] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.
[e] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

Table 3-50

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Summary % Agreement Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Summary % Agreement (S%A) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low %A (N=18)	High %A (N=17)	N	Low %A (N=9)	High %A (N=11)	N	Low %A (N=9)	High %A (N=6)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	33	71^{*a}	12	33	82^{*b}	6	33	50
Average Caseload	17	50	47	9	44	45	8	56	50
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	67	29^{*c}	11	78	36	6	56	17
% Vol.–O & A	17	44	53	7	22	45	10	67	67
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	44	53	9	33	55	8	56	50
% Vol.–General Hold	17	50	47	8	44	36	9	56	67
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	56	41	11	67	45	6	44	33
% Vol.–Job Entry	17	61	35	10	56	45	7	67	17
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	56	47	9	67	27	9	44	83
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	39	53	12	44	73	4	33	17
% Vol.–Suspense	17	39	59	10	44	55	7	33	67

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*)=3.48, $p<$..10.

[b] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p<.10$.

[c] χ^2 (1 *df*)=3.48, $p<.10$.

Table 3-51

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Summary % Disagreement Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Summary % Disagreement (S%D) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low %D (N=16)	High %D (N=19)	N	Low %D (N=8)	High %D (N=12)	N	Low %D (N=8)	High %D (N=7)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	56	47	12	75	50	6	38	43
Average Caseload	17	44	53	9	50	42	8	38	71
% Vol.–Initial Hold	17	31	63	11	38	67	6	25	57
% Vol.–O & A	17	56	42	7	38	33	10	75	57
% Vol.–WIN Training	17	56	42	9	62	33	8	50	57
% Vol.–General Hold	17	50	47	8	25	50	9	75	43
% Vol.–Completed Training	17	50	47	11	62	50	6	38	43
% Vol.–Job Entry	17	50	47	10	62	42	7	38	57
% Vol.–Abort Program	18	31	68^{**a}	9	12	67^{**b}	9	50	71
% Vol.–Completed Job Entry	16	44	47	12	75	50	4	12	43
% Vol.–Suspense	17	50	47	10	38	58	7	62	29

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*)=3.43, $p<.10$.

[b] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p<.05$.

Table 3-52

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Summary % Ambiguity Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Summary %—Ambiguity (S%U) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low %U (N=17)	High %U (N=18)	N	Low %U (N=11)	High %U (N=9)	N	Low %U (N=6)	High %U (N=9)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	71	33^{*a}	12	73	44	6	67	22
Average Caseload	17	47	50	9	36	56	8	67	44
% Vol.—Initial Hold	17	29	67^{*b}	11	27	89^{**c}	6	33	44
% Vol.—O & A	17	59	39	7	56	22	10	83	56
% Vol.—WIN Training	17	65	33	9	73	11^{**d}	8	50	56
% Vol.—General Hold	17	41	56	8	27	56	9	67	56
% Vol.—Completed Training	17	47	50	11	55	56	6	33	44
% Vol.—Job Entry	17	47	50	10	55	44	7	33	56
% Vol.—Abort Program	18	47	56	9	36	56	9	67	56
% Vol.—Completed Job Entry	16	53	39	12	64	56	4	33	22
% Vol.—Suspense	17	53	44	10	55	44	7	50	44

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*)=3.48, $p<.10$.
[b] χ^2 (1 *df*)=3.48, $p<.10$.
[c] Fisher Exact Test, (two-tailed), $p<.02$.
[d] Fisher Exact Test, (two-tailed), $p<.02$.

Table 3-53

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Spread of Team Decision Making Importance Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Team Decision Making Importance (Tm-DMI) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low Tm-DMI (N=19)	High Tm-DMI (N=16)	N	Low Tm-DMI (N=8)	High Tm-DMI (N=12)	N	Low Tm-DMI (N=11)	High Tm-DMI (N=4)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	53	50	12	62	58	6	45	25
Average Caseload	17	47	50	9	38	50	8	55	50
% Vol.—Initial Hold	17	47	50	11	50	58	6	45	25
% Vol.—O & A	17	53	44	7	38	33	10	64	75
% Vol.—WIN Training	17	47	50	9	50	42	8	45	75
% Vol.—General Hold	17	42	56	8	25	50	9	55	75
% Vol.—Completed Training	17	53	44	11	75	42	6	36	50
% Vol.—Job Entry	17	68	25^{**a}	10	75	33	7	64	00
% Vol.—Abort Program	18	47	56	9	25	58	9	64	50
% Vol.—Completed Job Entry	16	47	44	12	75	50	4	27	25
% Vol.—Suspense	17	47	50	10	50	50	7	45	50

[a] χ^2 (1 *df*) = 4.93, $p<.05$

Table 3-54

Percentage of Teams With High and Low Client Decision-Making Importance Scores That Were in High Category for Caseload Status Variables: Site-Visit Sample

Variable	Client Decision-Making Importance (CI-DMI) (%)								
	All Site-Visit Teams			Single-Team Offices			Multi-Team Offices		
	N	Low CI-DMI (N=18)	High CI-DMI (N-17)	N	Low CI-DMI (N=9)	High CI-DMI (N-11)	N	Low CI-DMI (N=9)	High CI-DMI (N=6)
6-Month Placement Rate	18	44	59	12	56	64	6	33	50
Average Caseload	17	39	59	9	33	55	8	44	67
% Vol.—Initial Hold	17	50	47	11	56	55	6	44	33
% Vol.—O & A	17	50	47	7	33	36	10	67	67
% Vol.—WIN Training	17	61	35	9	44	45	8	78	17*[a]
% Vol.—General Hold	17	44	53	8	37	45	9	56	67
% Vol.—Completed Training	17	39	59	11	67	45	6	11	83**[b]
% Vol.—Job Entry	17	50	47	10	67	36	7	33	67
% Vol.—Abort Program	18	44	59	9	33	55	9	56	67
% Vol.—Completed Job Entry	16	44	47	12	78	45	4	11	50
% Vol.—Suspense	17	56	41	10	56	45	7	56	33

[a] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .10$.

[b] Fisher Exact Test (two-tailed), $p < .05$.

Chapter 4

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The present study was designed to obtain information regarding (a) the staffing composition of WIN teams, (b) the work activities performed by the different manpower specialties represented on the teams, (c) the ways in which teams utilize and coordinate the efforts of team members and client during employability planning and decision making, and (d) the extent to which these factors contribute to the teams' effectiveness in the accomplishment of team and client goals.

TYPES OF WIN OFFICES

Findings reported in this study are based primarily on data obtained during site-visits to 50 WIN team locations distributed over 17 states. In addition, mail questionnaires completed by 59 teams located in 33 states provided supplementary data regarding team staffing and work activities performed by team members.

The objective in identifying teams for the study was to obtain a sample representative of the operational conditions under which teams function. To assist in achieving this objective, team locations were classified and selected on the basis of two control factors—number of teams working at a given office location, and population-size characteristics of the surrounding community.

Analyses of data concerning team member characteristics and work activities performed led to the conclusion that teams had essentially the same staffing composition and performed essentially the same duties whether located in small, medium, or very large communities (10). As a result, classification of teams along this dimension was dropped from consideration in the analyses presented in this report.

The classification of teams in terms of whether they constituted the only team at a location (single-team office) or were one of several teams staffing a location (multi-team office) was retained. In offices staffed with only one WIN team, team members provided all of the program services for their enrollees. This was also true in the majority of the multi-team offices; however, approximately one-third of these offices had one or more specialty groups that provided certain program services for enrollees of all the teams. The particular program services provided by these nonteam members varied considerably among this segment of the multi-team offices but included WIN Orientation, enrollment and clerical services, and job development.

Comparisons between teams from single-team and multi-team offices indicate that experience, education, and staffing composition of the two types are highly similar. The data do suggest that multi-team offices have placed less emphasis on team training for all team members. These teams more frequently show evidence of lack of coordination among team members and of less involvement of the various team members in decision making than do teams from single-team offices.

Rates of successful program outcome for enrollees from the two types of offices appear comparable. Thus, while there are some differences in team functioning under the two conditions, there does not appear to be any need to consider these two types of offices separately in considering recommendations regarding team performance.

JOB POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

Analysis of data collected on duties and tasks performed by WIN team members resulted in five job position descriptions. These five descriptions emphasize specialties in major duty areas for each job position consistent with general expectations based on the WIN team guidelines.

The coaches are identified with the major expenditure of effort in the duty area concerned with provision of supportive services and monitoring of enrollee progress; and, to a lesser extent in record maintenance and procedures.

Counselors expend their greatest level of effort in tasks directly concerned with developing enrollees' employability goals. They expend a lesser but still distinctive level of effort in three other areas—supportive services and monitoring of enrollee progress; initial assignment of enrollees; and monitoring and provision of education, work, and training component resources.

Job developers exhibit their major expenditure of effort in the area of job development and placement, and a secondary lower level of effort in monitoring and providing education, work, and training components.

Work-training specialists appear more as generalists than do persons in the other positions and tend to distribute their effort more evenly over all duty areas. It is this relative lack of duty area identification that makes their job position profile distinctive from the profiles of each of the other job positions.

Clerical members of the teams concentrate their time primarily in two duty areas—record maintenance and procedures; and receipt and processing of referrals.

A major finding of this study has been that the more effective teams deemphasize the separation among job position specialties and distribute the teams' work load so as to involve all team members in a broader range of the work activities. It would appear that the greater range of team-member participation gives the members a better understanding of the enrollee; that mutual work experiences provide a better basis for communicating with each other, and a stronger identification with the team and its objectives than with a job specialty title.

As a result of these findings, job position descriptions presented here are based on the teams that deemphasized job position specialties. Table 4-1 presents estimates of the time distribution over the major duty areas of each job position. Table 4-2 presents the detailed job descriptions for the positions and also shows the time effort expended by each position in relation to each of the other team member positions.

In Table 4-2, job activities identified with an "H" (major time effort) or an "M" (moderate time effort) are both considered to reflect job activity requirements for that position. Activities identified with an "L" (very little time effort) are considered to be those that may or may not be performed by the particular job position depending on the individual and the team circumstances. Underlining of the letter designation for a particular job position indicates that the occupant of that job position would generally be expected to expend a greater amount of time in performing the job activity than would be expected of the other team members.

Table 4-1

Distribution of Relative Time Estimate Means Over Duty Areas for Each Job Position[a]

(Percent)

Major Duty Area	Description	Job Positions[b]				
		Coach (N=22)	Counselor (N=24)	Job Developer (N=19)	Work-Training Specialist (N=18)	Clerk (N=20)
1	Receives and processes Welfare Department referral forms	6.8	5.2	4.8	6.8	16.4
2	Accomplishes enrollment and initial assessment of applicants	9.5	10.7	10.0	12.0	6.7
3	Accomplishes initial assignment of enrollee	3.3	8.3	4.2	6.5	2.8
4-A	Conducts or assists in conducting orientation and formal assessment	6.4	8.1	5.2	6.4	1.8
4-B	Works with enrollee to develop employability goals and plan	4.2	14.2	7.4	6.7	2.0
5	Assists enrollee in obtaining needed services and supervises his progress during enrollment	33.9	19.2	18.5	17.9	8.8
6	Conducts determinations in case of applicant/enrollee referred for determination decision	6.0	8.0	5.6	6.7	5.5
7	Provides education, work and training component resources to service the job-preparation needs of WIN enrollees	3.8	8.1	12.5	11.9	1.1
8	Develops and/or locates job opportunities for WIN enrollees	3.8	3.9	19.9	10.0	0.3
9	Performs internal team management functions necessary to coordinate and support team efforts with the individual enrollees	5.6	6.7	4.3	6.3	11.0
10	Performs clerical duties required for initiation and maintenance of records and preparation of reports	15.6	7.9	7.6	8.5	43.9
Total		98.9	100.3	100.0	99.7	100.3

[a] Means based on average job position score for each team.

[b] Number of teams from among the 25 most effective teams having the given job position.

Table 4-2

Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions[a]

	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerical
RECEIVES AND PROCESSES WELFARE DEPARTMENT REFERRAL FORMS					
1. Reviews referral forms to identify applicant's enrollment priority and to determine need for additional information prior to scheduling.	H	M	M	H	H
2. Contacts Welfare if additional information is needed regarding a referral.	H	L	M	M	H
3. Evaluates, on basis of referral information whether applicant can be considered appropriate for scheduling for enrollment at that time.	M	M	M	H	M
4. Notifies Welfare of referrals considered inappropriate for enrollment under their existing circumstances.	M	M	L	M	H
5. Schedules referrals for enrollment interview and notifies applicant and Welfare Department.	M	M	L	M	H
6. Notifies Welfare when an applicant does not appear for an enrollment interview.	M	M	L	M	H
7. Maintains records on referrals received.	M	L	M	L	H
ACCOMPLISHES ENROLLMENT AND INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF APPLICANT					
8. Conducts enrollment interview with applicant.	H	H	H	H	M

(Continued)

[a] Distributions of the average percent time scores were pooled for the five job positions. Entries designate upper (H), middle (M), and lower (L) thirds of the pooled distribution. Dash (—) indicates activity not performed; underlined entries designate job position with numerically largest time score for the given activity.

Table 4-2 *(Continued)*

Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions[a]

	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerical
ACCOMPLISHES ENROLLMENT AND INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF APPLICANT (Continued)					
9. Decides on the appropriateness of enrollment on the basis of the additional information obtained during the enrollment interview.	H	H	H	H	L
10. Completes enrollment of applicants considered appropriate for enrollment.	M	H	H	H	H
11. Discusses with applicant who refuses enrollment his reasons for refusing and explains possible consequences of refusal.	M	M	M	M	L
12. Schedules applicant who continues to refuse enrollment for a Determination decision.	M	L	L	L	L
13. Refers applicants interviewed and considered not appropriate candidates for enrollment back to Welfare Department.	L	M	L	M	H
14. Identifies new enrollee as job ready.	M	H	H	M	L
15. Identifies new enrollee as requiring education, training, and/or special employability orientation services.	H	H	H	H	L
ACCOMPLISHES INITIAL ASSIGNMENT OF ENROLLEE					
16. Develops initial assignment plans for a new enrollee.	M	H	M	M	L
17. Refers new enrollees considered employable to job placement service.	L	H	M	H	L

(Continued)

---

[a] Distributions of the average percent time scores were pooled for the five job positions. Entries designate upper (H), middle (M), and lower (L) thirds of the pooled distribution. Dash (—) indicates activity not performed; underlined entries designate job position with numerically largest time score for the given activity.

Table 4-2 *(Continued)*

Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions[a]

	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerical
ACCOMPLISHES INITIAL ASSIGNMENT OF ENROLLEE (Continued)					
18. Arranges for new enrollees to be enrolled in WIN Orientation.	M	H	M	M	H
18. Refers new enrollees for further, more extensive, vocational assessment.	L	H	L	H	L
20. Refers new enrollees possessing employable skills but exhibiting special employability problems to special employment preparation sessions.	L	M	L	M	L
CONDUCTS OR ASSISTS IN CONDUCTING ORIENTATION AND FORMAL ASSESSMENT					
21. Plans or assists in planning and conducting WIN Orientation sessions.	M	M	M	H	M
22. Conducts sessions with enrollees to assist them in identifying and coping with attitudes and habits which are likely to interfere with attainment of employment goals.	H	H	H	M	L
23. Determines which assessment procedure or techniques will be appropriate for use with a particular enrollee.	M	H	M	M	L
24. Arranges for administration of the selected assessment tests or procedures.	M	H	M	M	—
25. Administers standard tests and other assessment procedures to enrollees.	M	M	M	H	—

(Continued)

---

[a] Distributions of the average percent time scores were pooled for the five job positions. Entries designate upper (H), middle (M), and lower (L) thirds of the pooled distribution. Dash (—) indicates activity not performed; underlined entries designate job position with numerically largest time score for the given activity.

Table 4-2 *(Continued)*

Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions[a]

	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerical
WORKS WITH ENROLLEE TO DEVELOP EMPLOYABILITY GOALS AND PLAN					
26. Interprets the results of standard tests and other assessment procedures in terms of their implications for the future plans of the individual enrollee.	L	H̲	L	L	—
27. Reviews work history, educational achievement, and job related aptitudes with individual enrollee in relation to possible training and vocational goals.	M	H̲	H	M	L
28. Identifies employability goals appropriate to the enrollee.	M	H̲	M	M	L
29. Determines the specific educational, work, and/or training components to which the enrollee will be assigned.	M	H̲	M	M	L
30. Makes arrangements for the enrollee to obtain the education, training, work experience, or job placement services appropriate to his employability plan.	M	H	H̲	H	M
ASSISTS ENROLLEE IN OBTAINING NEEDED SERVICES AND SUPERVISES HIS PROGRESS DURING ENROLLMENT					
31. Coordinates with Welfare representative to assist enrollee in obtaining aid and services required to enable him to continue to participate in the program.	H̲	H̲	M	H	L
32. Contacts individual enrollees to determine whether they are receiving aid and services for which arrangements were made.	H̲	M	M	H	L

(Continued)

---

[a] Distributions of the average percent time scores were pooled for the five job positions. Entries designate upper (H), middle (M), and lower (L) thirds of the pooled distribution. Dash (—) indicates activity not performed; underlined entries designate job position with numerically largest time score for the given activity.

Table 4-2 *(Continued)*

Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions[a]

	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerical
ASSISTS ENROLLEE IN OBTAINING NEEDED SERVICES AND SUPERVISES HIS PROGRESS DURING ENROLLMENT (Continued)					
33. Monitors enrollee's attendance and progress in achievement during enrollment in education, training, or work experience components.	H	H	M	H	H
34. Contacts individual enrollees who have missed appointments or failed to attend education, training, or work experience sessions, to determine reason for nonattendance.	H	H	M	H	H
35. Discusses with enrollee his refusal to accept assignment or his failure to participate in component and explains possible consequences of continued refusal to participate.	H	H	M	H	L
36. Discusses with enrollee his failure or refusal to accept referral to employment or to accept employment offered and explains possible consequences of continued failure or refusal.	H	H	H	H	L
37. Schedules enrollees who fail to participate or fail to accept employment referrals or employment offers for Determination decision.	H	L	M	M	L
38. Determines through periodic reassessment of individual enrollees' status and progress, whether there is need for revision of the individual's employability plan.	M	H	M	M	L
39. Modifies or reorients enrollee's employability plan and the services provided on the basis of decisions made during reassessment of his progress.	L	H	M	M	L

(Continued)

---

[a] Distributions of the average percent time scores were pooled for the five job positions. Entries designate upper (H), middle (M), and lower (L) thirds of the pooled distribution. Dash (—) indicates activity not performed; underlined entries designate job position with numerically largest time score for the given activity.

Table 4-2 *(Continued)*

Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions[a]

	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerical
ASSISTS ENROLLEE IN OBTAINING NEEDED SERVICES AND SUPERVISES HIS PROGRESS DURING ENROLLMENT (Continued)					
40. Provides regular follow-up services for enrollees who have obtained job positions.	H	L	H	M	M
41. Provides intensive follow-up services for enrollees who have obtained job positions.	H	L	H	M	L
42. Identifies and refers for termination enrollees who have proven unable to progress sufficiently to make further utilization of WIN services practical.	H	H	H	M	M
43. Identifies and refers for termination enrollees who are satisfactorily employed and are no longer in need of WIN program services.	H	M	H	M	M
CONDUCTS DETERMINATIONS IN CASE OF APPLICANT/ ENROLLEE REFERRED FOR DETERMINATION DECISION					
44. Determines whether enrollee's refusal of employment was with or without good cause.	M	M	M	M	M
45. Determines whether enrollee's refusal of referral to employment was with or without good cause.	M	M	M	M	L
46. Determines whether applicant's refusal to enroll was with or without good cause.	M	M	M	M	L

(Continued)

---

[a] Distributions of the average percent time scores were pooled for the five job positions. Entries designate upper (H), middle (M), and lower (L) thirds of the pooled distribution. Dash (—) indicates activity not performed; underlined entries designate job position with numerically largest time score for the given activity.

Table 4-2 *(Continued)*

Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions[a]

	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerical
CONDUCTS DETERMINATIONS IN CASE OF APPLICANT/ ENROLLEE REFERRED FOR DETERMINATION DECISION (Continued)					
47. Determines whether enrollee's refusal of assignment in WIN was with or without good cause.	M	M	M	M	L
48. Determines whether enrollee's de facto refusal to participate is with or without good cause.	L	M	L	M	M
49. Notifies enrollee of the Determination decision, the effect it will have on his Welfare grant, and his future status in the WIN program.	M	M	L	M	M
50. Notifies Welfare Department of the Determination decision.	L	M	L	L	M
51. Notifies enrollee whose refusal is considered not valid of his right to appeal and the procedures for appeal.	L	M	L	L	M
52. Represents the Department of Employment at WIN Appeal Hearings.	L	L	L	L	—
PROVIDES EDUCATION AND WORK AND TRAINING COMPONENT RESOURCES TO SERVICE THE JOB-PREPARATION NEEDS OF WIN ENROLLEES					
53. Analyzes present and projected labor market requirements in light of anticipated job qualification characteristics of WIN enrollees, and extent and kinds of vocational preparation feasible within the framework of the WIN program.	L	H	H	H	—

(Continued)

---

[a] Distributions of the average percent time scores were pooled for the five job positions. Entries designate upper (H), middle (M), and lower (L) thirds of the pooled distribution. Dash (—) indicates activity not performed; underlined entries designate job position with numerically largest time score for the given activity.

Table 4-2 *(Continued)*

Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions[a]

	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerical
PROVIDES EDUCATION AND WORK AND TRAINING COMPONENT RESOURCES TO SERVICE THE JOB-PREPARATION NEEDS OF WIN ENROLLEES (Continued)					
54. Reviews on a continuing basis, the vocational plans and aspirations of enrollees in the program.	L	H	H	H	L
55. Determines the occupational areas in the local labor market likely to serve as the goals of enrollees' employability plans.	L	H	H	H	L
56. Identifies qualified agencies within the local area competent to provide education or work training component services consistent with the WIN program's objectives.	M	H	H	H	L
57. Develops agreements with qualified agencies to provide education or work training programs.	L	L	H	H	L
58. Monitors operation of education and work and training components to assure that they continue to meet WIN enrollee needs and WIN program standards.	L	M	H	H	—
DEVELOPS AND/OR LOCATES JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR WIN ENROLLEES					
59. Studies employment practices and problems of local public and private employers to identify areas which might permit development of increased employment opportunities for WIN enrollees.	L	M	H	H	
60. Interests and assists employers in identifying and modifying irrelevant or unrealistically stringent employment standards.	L	—	H	L	—

(Continued)

---

[a] Distributions of the average percent time scores were pooled for the five job positions. Entries designate upper (H), middle (M), and lower (L) thirds of the pooled distribution. Dash (—) indicates activity not performed; underlined entries designate job position with numerically largest time score for the given activity.

Table 4-2 *(Continued)*

Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions[a]

	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerical
DEVELOPS AND/OR LOCATES JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR WIN ENROLLEES (Continued)					
61. Interests and assists employers in restructuring jobs and career advancement opportunities.	L	—	H	M	—
62. Works with or through job development personnel of other agencies to achieve increased employment opportunities for WIN enrollees.	L	L	H	M	L
63. Initiates and maintains contacts with local employers in an effort to locate and identify appropriate jobs for specific WIN enrollees.	L	L	H	M	—
64. Works through the local State Employment Office to locate job opportunities for WIN enrollees nearing completion of their employment preparation or training.	L	L	H	H	L
65. Advises the team regarding the adequacy of training services provided and their relevance to employers' hiring standards and the skills required on the job.	L	L	H	H	—
66. Advises the team regarding the appropriateness of individual enrollees' employability plans in relation to job opportunities and hiring standards.	M	M	H	H	—

(Continued)

---

[a] Distributions of the average percent time scores were pooled for the five job positions. Entries designate upper (H), middle (M), and lower (L) thirds of the pooled distribution. Dash (—) indicates activity not performed; underlined entries designate job position with numerically largest time score for the given activity.

Table 4-2 *(Continued)*

Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions[a]

	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerical
PERFORMS INTERNAL TEAM MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS NECESSARY TO COORDINATE AND SUPPORT TEAM MEMBER EFFORTS WITH THE INDIVIDUAL ENROLLEES					
67. Plans and/or supervises the maintenance of an individual case folder record system.	L	M	L	H	H
68. Plans and/or supervises the maintenance of a system to provide Team members with information concerning the current enrollment status of each enrollee.	M	M	L	M	H
69. Calls or arranges scheduling of Team conferences to accomplish employability planning for individual enrollees.	L	H	L	M	M
70. Assigns or distributes enrollee caseload responsibilities to individual Team members.	L	M	L	L	L
71. Plans inservice training and workshops for WIN Team members.	—	L	L	L	—
72. Conducts inservice training and workshops for WIN Team members.	—	L	L	L	—
73. Attends inservice training and workshops for WIN Team members.	M	M	M	M	L
74. Reads and reviews WIN directives to keep abreast of program guidance relevant to Team members' duties and functions.	H	M	H	M	H

(Continued)

---

[a] Distributions of the average percent time scores were pooled for the five job positions. Entries designate upper (H), middle (M), and lower (L) thirds of the pooled distribution. Dash (—) indicates activity not performed; underlined entries designate job position with numerically largest time score for the given activity.

Table 4-2 *(Continued)*

Job Activities Performed by Each of the Team Member Job Positions[a]

	Coach	Counselor	Job Developer	Work-Training Specialist	Clerical
PERFORMS CLERICAL DUTIES REQUIRED FOR INITIATION AND MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS AND PREPARATION OF REPORTS					
75. Initiates individual case folder for each new enrollee.	H	L	M	M	H
76. Records progress notes and other relevant information in the individual's enrollee's record folder.	H	H	H	H	H
77. Prepares letter or forms required to authorize the individual's enrollment in WIN components.	H	M	M	H	H
78. Prepares letters or forms required upon termination of an individual's enrollment in the program.	M	M	M	L	H
79. Maintains records showing current enrollment status of each enrollee.	H	M	M	M	H
80. Prepares letters or forms required to notify appropriate agencies of changes in the individual's enrollment status.	M	M	M	H	H
81. Prepares letters or forms required for enrollee to be authorized to receive WIN incentive payments.	H	M	M	M	H
82. Prepares monthly program activity or other periodic administrative reports.	M	L	M	L	H

---

[a] Distributions of the average percent time scores were pooled for the five job positions. Entries designate upper (H), middle (M), and lower (L) thirds of the pooled distribution. Dash (—) indicates activity not performed; underlined entries designate job position with numerically largest time score for the given activity.

TEAM STAFFING PATTERNS AND STAFFING RECOMMENDATIONS

WIN team staffing recommended in the WIN Handbook consists of five job position specialties: coach, counselor, job developer, work-training specialist, and clerk-stenographer. Data in the present study, collected from a total of 110 teams distributed among 35 states, reflect a great diversity in team staffing—a total of 18 different staffing patterns among the 110 teams.

These patterns ranged from a six-position pattern to one based simply on the counselor. Teams staffed with the full five-position staffing pattern constituted only 35% of these 110 teams. Order of priority when less than the five positions were staffed starts with the counselor as the position almost always staffed; second priority is for the coach; third priority is essentially a tie between the job developer and the clerk; finally, least frequently staffed is the work-training specialist position.

Disregarding job position identity, number of team members ranged from one to ten with the most common size of staff being five to six team members. Teams' average monthly caseload, based on the three-month period used in this study, ranged from 12 (a new office) to 323; the median caseload was approximately 160 enrollees. When data collection arrangements were being made for this study, most states appeared to be determining size of team staffs by assuming that a five-man team was expected to handle a caseload of 200 enrollees. Therefore, one team member could be assigned for every 50 enrollee slots authorized for the team. It was subsequently observed that states were experimenting with staffing ratios ranging from one team member per every 25 authorized enrollee slots to one per every 75 slots. Data collected in the present study show no relationship between size of team staff and actual average monthly caseload.

Results of this study indicate that guidelines for staffings of WIN teams should consider four basic job position specialties instead of the current five. These four are coach, counselor, job developer, and the clerical position, deleting the work-training specialist. Two types of evidence support this conclusion:

(1) The job position descriptions reported in the preceding section indicated that the work-training specialist tends to serve as an apprentice or assistant to both the counselor and the job developer and, in addition, often seems to be cast as the supervisor of the coach and clerk. Thus, the individual serving in this position has no particular caseload services or specialty identification.

(2) Teams staffed with the full five job positions show evidence of relatively high role disagreement among team members more frequently than do teams staffed with fewer than the five positions. The paygrade and experience hierarchy of the Employment Service as applied to WIN team structure appears to be: first, the counselor who is usually the team leader; then job developer; work-training specialist, third; and coach and clerk approximately tied for the lowest pay and experience level positions.

It is our conclusion that if all five positions are staffed, the presence of the work-training specialist position, as it has been implemented, reduces the effectiveness of the team. It should be made clear that it is not the job incumbent that is the problem, it is the staffing structure considered within the Employment Service context. This position as assistant to both the counselor and the job developer, and as supervisor of the coach and the clerk, has the effect of separating the team into status layers; this minimizes the job duty communication and coordination interaction between the counselor and job developer on the one hand, and the coach on the other hand. The coach's major duty responsibility of monitoring the enrollees' progress during enrollment make close communication between this person and the counselor and job developer very important.

TEAM MEMBER AND TEAM TRAINING

A major finding of this study concerns in-service team training and the conditions under which training has an impact on team performance. These data stress the importance of *all* team members receiving team training as a necessary condition for its impact on team performance.

When these conditions are met, the training appears to provide a common frame of reference for team members that reduces confusion regarding the nature of each other's job role and provides an initial basis for the development of effective functioning. Additional major effects of team training vary depending on the length of time team members have worked together. Teams whose members have all received training exhibit a more thorough approach to employability planning and, particularly among the less experienced teams, the use of team conferences to accomplish planning and decision making. While the use of team conferences has generally been strongly emphasized in training, it has been found in this study that the majority of teams using conferences are not able to use them effectively. This is attributed to a general failure to conduct team training beyond an initial "one-shot" session.

Currently, the most effective coordination of team member efforts and development of employability planning appears to come about as a combined result of team training and longer periods of team member experience in working together. Again, a necessary condition is that all of the team members have received the training. These teams appear to achieve their more effective functioning through informal working relationships. They tend to deemphasize job position specialties in distributing the teams' work load and involve all team members in a broader range of the team's work activities. Their greater effectiveness is evident not only in better communication and coordination among team members but, also, in higher rates of successful program outcome for their enrollees (25 to 60% of program terminations).

The development of greater team effectiveness through the combination of team training for all team members and 15 months or more of subsequent experience in working together is encouraging to note. However, normal team member turnover and the general absence of follow-up training make it unlikely that many teams will develop effective performance by this formula. Our observations indicated that team training sessions were usually held when WIN projects were initiated, but that most states did not have the capability of continuing these efforts to meet either formal follow-up requirements or the problem of team member turnover. These observations also suggest that subsequent training conducted by state offices has generally been limited to instruction on changes in administrative policies and forms.

Training of Employability Development teams represents a problem that extends beyond the WIN program. With the anticipation of the Family Assistance Program (FAP) and the extension of the team approach to other manpower programs, the response in some states has been to transfer key personnel from existing WIN teams to serve as cadre for on-the-job development of new teams. This degrades the effectiveness of the existing WIN teams and provides, at best, an inadequate approach to the training of new teams.

For further improvement of team effectiveness, it is recommended that a system be established for entry-level and follow-up training for team member job positions and teams as a unit. Present observations indicate that, in general, both individual job position and team training have had a very low priority.

Historically, the Employment Service has trained its own employees at the local office level by a type of step-by-step career advancement system, depending heavily on on-the-job training interspersed with periodic phases of in-service classroom training. While this system apparently worked well when there was no expansion of staff, current demands for a relatively rapid expansion of operating staff cannot be met. The recently launched effort to contract with local training institutions to provide entry-level counselor training represents a promising approach to meeting training needs; it could be extended to include the other job positions, as well as the team as a group.

The focus of team and team member training should be on skills and knowledges that the team can use to influence program outcome for its enrollees. Currently these skills and knowledges would vary considerably from state to state because of differential restrictions placed on the degree of control the team can exercise over use of program resources. For example, there appears to be wide variation in the extent to which teams can actually identify and contract for training for individual enrollees. Teams that have little operational freedom in this regard have lost what is probably one of their most important tools for influencing program outcome for their enrollees.

Disregarding current variations among states, training that focuses on the teams' ability to influence program outcome should include training in the following: the obtaining and utilization of local labor market information; the obtaining and utilization of information regarding local training resources; the accomplishing of training contracts for individual enrollees; conduct and use of employability orientation training in working with the enrollee during development of employability goals; procedures for maintaining contact with the enrollee during training and the job entry follow-up period; and organization of the team's collective effort in a manner to support close communication and coordination among themselves, with the enrollee, and with the welfare representative.

INITIAL ASSIGNMENT PRACTICES

During data collection, it was learned that regardless of variations in content, teams that tended to use Orientation routinely as an initial assignment for the not-job-ready emphasized its value. It provided a period of time during which the team could interact with the enrollee and the enrollee could consider alternative goals before reaching a decision.

Data from the present study suggest that in areas of relatively low unemployment, teams routinely refer enrollees considered not-job-ready to WIN Orientation and use this period of enrollment to interact with them in developing employability goals and plans. Enrollees of these teams achieve relatively high rates of successful program terminations. In contrast, in areas of relatively high unemployment, teams do not routinely refer the not-job-ready to WIN Orientation and instead tend to make initial assignments directly to work or training components. Since this is generally done on the basis of one or two contacts with the enrollee, this means that tentative employability plans and goals have been identified with very little interaction between the enrollee and the team. Enrollees of these teams have relatively low rates of successful program completion (fewer than 25% of all terminations).

Conclusions drawn from these data have to be approached with caution; there is a modest relationship between successful termination rates and unemployment rates for the corresponding labor areas. However, if it is generally true that teams in areas of relatively high unemployment "skip over" the effort of working out employability plans with their enrollees, it seems unlikely that the assignments made to work and training components would lead to job placements. Thus, these findings raise questions regarding the extent to which the lower rates of program success in areas of high unemployment are due simply to lack of available jobs, or to lack of team effort in working with enrollees to develop acceptable employability plans. Further study would be required to develop specific implications of these findings for program design and management.

LITERATURE CITED AND APPENDICES

LITERATURE CITED

1. Department of Labor. *The Work Incentive Program*, First Annual Report of the Department of Labor to the Congress on Training and Employment Under Title IV of the Social Security Act, Washington, June 1970.
2. Department of Labor. *Manpower Report of the President*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, March 1970.
3. Department of Labor. *Manpower Report of the President*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, April 1971.
4. Department of Labor, Office Manpower Management Data Systems, Manpower Administration. "WIN Program Data: Cumulative Enrollments and Terminations and Current Enrollment, by Region, State, and Project as of June 30, 1970." (monthly report).
5. Goodwin, Leonard. *A Study of the Work Orientation of Welfare Recipients Participating in the Work Incentive Program*, Brookings Institute, Washington, August 1971 (NTIS PB-202812).
6. Mangum, Garth. *The Total Impact of Manpower Program: A Four-City Case Study. Vol. 1: Summary of the Final Report*, Olympus Research Corp., Washington, August 1971 (NTIS PB-202929; DOL Rept MEL-71-05a).
7. Analytic Systems Inc. *Analysis of WIN Program Termination Data (Fiscal Year 1970)*, Washington, May 1971 (NTIS PB-200690; DOL Report MEL-71-01b).
8. Auerbach Associates, Inc. *WIN System Analysis: Final Report and WIN Model*, Philadelphia, Pa., April 1971 (NTIS PB-199101; DOL Report MEL-71-14a).
9. Osborn, William C., Boycan, G. Gary, and Haggard, Donald F. *Development of A Program of Instruction for WIN Employability Orientation*, HumRRO Technical Report 72-3, February 1972.
10. Kern, Richard P., and Caylor, John S. *Analyses of WIN Team Functioning and Job Requirements. Phase 1: Duties and Tasks Performed by Teams and Team Members*, HumRRO Technical Report 71-19, August 1971.
11. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. *Work Incentive Program (WIN) Handbook*, Washington, July 1968.
12. Siegel, Sidney, *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., N.Y. 1956.
13. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. *Area Trends in Employment and Unemployment*, October 1971.
14. Morsh, Joseph E., and Archer, Wayne B. *Procedural Guide for Conducting Occupational Surveys in the United States Air Force*, PRL-TR-67-11, Personnel Research Laboratory, Lackland AFB, Tex., September 1967.

Appendix A

STUDY DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

APPROACH

The material presented in this appendix summarizes the major features of the approach followed in the selection of data collection locations, identification of WIN teams and team members, and data collection procedures for the site-visit and the mail-questionnaire samples used in this study.

IDENTIFICATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF WIN TEAM LOCATIONS

The study required a nationwide sampling of WIN teams identified as representative of the operational conditions under which the teams function. With the cooperation of the 10 Regional Manpower Administrators and the state sponsors, information was obtained from each state identifying the separate WIN office locations within the state and the WIN team staffing at each location.

For this study, it was necessary to exclude Hawaii, Alaska, and the Trust Territories from consideration for site visits. Of the remaining 48 states within the continental boundaries, New Hampshire had not yet initiated WIN projects; Indiana was just commencing program activities; and in three states (Washington, Oregon, and Idaho) a high proportion (83%) of office locations were staffed with less than a full team and were dispersed among the small rural towns. As a result of these considerations, these five states were excluded, leaving a total pool of 43 states to be considered for data collection.

Office locations were classified into five office-type categories:

Office Type I: Single-team offices; rural or small urban community.
Office Type II: Single-team offices; small Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) community.
Office Type III: Single-team offices; large SMSA community.
Office Type IV: Two-to-three team offices; large SMSA community.
Office Type V: Four-or-more-team offices; large SMSA community.

Any city or town under 50,000 population, which is not included in an SMSA, was defined as rural or small urban. Cities or towns located within an SMSA were classified on the basis of the population for the SMSA. SMSAs under 250,000 population were labeled "Small SMSAs" while those of 250,000 or more were labeled "Large SMSAs." The tables used for these classifications were Bureau of the Census abstracts for metropolitan area statistics with population figures as of July 1966.

SELECTION OF DATA COLLECTION LOCATIONS

Data collection during this study required two samples of WIN teams. Both samples were selected from the pool of office locations (classified in Table A-1), which comprise all such office locations in the 43 states. One sample consisted of 51 WIN office locations, at each of which one WIN team was identified to respond to interview and questionnaire procedures during on-site visits by members of the research staff. A second sample consisted of 71 WIN office locations, at each of which one team was identified to receive and respond to the questionnaire procedures through the mails. Agreements to participate, scheduling, and conducting data collection for the two samples were timed to be accomplished concurrently.

The on-site locations were selected first with the restriction that only one office location of a given office type could be selected within each state. Thus, if a state had office locations classified in each of the five office-type categories, a maximum of five office locations, one from each category, could be identified for on-site data collection. The same restrictions were imposed during selection of the mail-questionnaire sample with the additional restriction that office locations identified for the site-visit sample were not eligible.

Table A-1

Final Sampling Categories: Distribution of Team Locations, by Category, in the Final Pool of 43 States

Location	Number of WIN Office Locations					
	Office Type[a]					Total
	I	II	III	IV	V	
REGION I						
Connecticut		1		2	1	4
Maine	1	2				3
Massachusetts	2	6	13	3		24
Rhode Island			2	1		3
Vermont	2					2
REGION II						
New Jersey	2	1	4	1	1	9
New York			7	8	6	21
REGION III						
Delaware			1			1
Maryland	3		2		1	6
Pennsylvania	4	2	19		1	26
Virginia		1	1	3		5
West Virginia	12	1	2			15
REGION IV						
Alabama	1	1	1	1		4
Florida		1	3	3		7
Georgia		2	4			6
Kentucky	6	1	1		1	9
Mississippi	1		1			2
North Carolina		3	1			4
South Carolina	1		1			2
Tennessee	2		2	3		7

(Continued)

Table A-1 *(Continued)*

Final Sampling Categories: Distribution of Team Locations, by Category, in the Final Pool of 43 States

Location	Number of WIN Office Locations					
	Office Type[a]					Total
	I	II	III	IV	V	
REGION V						
Illinois		1	1	2	2	6
Michigan	2	3	4	2	1	12
Minnesota	1		1	2		4
Ohio	4	3	7	3	1	18
Wisconsin	6	3	2		1	12
REGION VI						
Arkansas	3	1	1			5
Louisiana	1	2	2	1		6
New Mexico	1			1		2
Oklahoma	2		2			4
Texas			1	3		4
REGION VII						
Iowa	1	3	3			7
Kansas	3		2			5
Missouri					2	2
Nebraska		1		1		2
REGION VIII						
Colorado	13		4		1	18
Montana	4	2				6
North Dakota	3	1				4
South Dakota	5	1				6
Utah	4				1	5
Wyoming	2					2
REGION IX						
Arizona			1	1	1	3
California	6	4	7	14	9	40
Nevada		1				1
Total Locations	98	48	103	56	30	334
Number States Represented	29	26	31	19	15	43

[a] Office Type I: Single-team offices; rural or small urban community.

Office Type II: Single-team offices; small Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) community.

Office Type III: Single-team offices; large SMSA community.

Office Type IV: Two-to-three-team offices; large SMSA community.

Office Type V: Four-or-more-team offices; large SMSA community.

Identification of Site Data Collection Locations

Research plans were for data to be collected during site visits to approximately 50 teams evenly distributed among the five office-type categories. Because of the wide variations among states in the distribution of office locations among the five office-type categories, time and cost were important factors in identifying office locations for the site-visit sample. Because state policies might be expected to influence team staffing and style of operations, it was considered important that a particular state not be represented by more than one office location or one team in any office-type category.

As a result, it was decided to identify states for the site-visit sample by selecting those that would form the smallest number of states required to obtain the 10 locations (or teams) for each office type, with the further restriction that not more than one location (or team) of the same office type be included from a given state. This resulted in a list of 15 states. By the time data-collection arrangements were finalized, one state had to be deleted because of inability to participate, and three other states were added, for a total of 17.

The final list of states identified for data collection by means of site visits is presented in Table A-2, which shows the office locations within each state from which data were wanted. As noted in Table A-1, there were many cases of only one office location of the particular type within that state; where there was more than one, the data-collection location was chosen randomly. Totals in the right-hand column of Table A-2 present the number of locations in each state at which site visits were made. Column totals show the number of site-visit locations used for each office type.

Table A-2

Office-Type Locations Where Data Were Collected On-Site

Location	Office Type[a]					Total Site-Visit Locations
	I	II	III	IV	V	
REGION I						
Massachusetts	x	x	x	x	0	4
REGION II						
New Jersey	x	x	x	x	x	5
New York	0	0	–	x	x	2
REGION III						
Pennsylvania	x	x	x	0	x	4
West Virginia	x	x	x	0	0	3
REGION IV						
Alabama	x	x	x	x	0	4
Kentucky	x	x	x	0	x	4
Tennessee	–	0	–	x	0	1
REGION V						
Illinois	0	x	–	x	x	3
Ohio	x	x	x	x	x	5
REGION VI						
Louisiana	x	x	x	x	0	4

(Continued)

Table A-2 *(Continued)*

Office-Type Locations Where Data Were Collected On-Site

Location	Office Type[a]					Total Site-Visit Locations
	I	II	III	IV	V	
REGION VII						
Iowa	x	x	x	0	0	3
Missouri	0	0	0	0	x	1
Nebraska	0	—	0	x	0	1
REGION VIII						
Colorado	x	0	x	—	x	1
REGION IX						
Arizona	0	0	—	—	x	1
California	—	x	x	x	—	3
Total Site-Visit Locations	10	11	11	10	9	51

[a] x: indicates data collected from one team at one location of the given office type.

0: indicates state did not have office locations of given type.

—: indicates the state had one or more office locations of that type, but they were not identified for data collection.

Identification of Mail-Questionnaire Sample

In Table A-3, line 1 indicates the total number of states in the 43-state pool (Table A-1) having one or more office locations in a given office-type category. Line 2 shows the number of states remaining eligible for the mail-questionnaire sample after application of the restriction that the same office location cannot be used in both on-site and mail-questionnaire samples. To illustrate, of the states identified for on-site data collection at Office Type I locations, three (Alabama, Louisiana, and Iowa) had only one such office location (see Table A-1). Among the 43 states in the sampling pool, 29 had one or more Office Type I location; applying the restriction against duplicating office locations in site-visit and mail samples, 26 states remained eligible for consideration in the mail-questionnaire sample.

Line 3 shows the number of states that were selected for the mail-questionnaire sample and requested to participate. Comparison of Lines 2 and 3 shows that most of the states in the pool within each sampling category were selected. If there were more than 20 states in the pool, selection was accomplished by using a table of random numbers to draw 20 states, with each state being represented, until drawn, as many times as it had office locations in the given office-type category. If a state that was selected had more than one office location of the given office type, the location to receive the questionnaires was identified by using a table of random numbers.

Line 4 indicates the number of states in each sampling category that declined the request for participation. Line 5 presents the number of states in each category to which the questionnaires were mailed. Questionnaires were sent to a total of 71 locations.

Line 6 presents the number of states in which the office locations successfully completed and returned the mail questionnaires. Criteria of successful completion were

Table A-3

Resume of States Participating in the Mail Questionnaire Sample in Relation to Initial Pool

Item	Number of States Represented					
	Office Type					Total States Represented
	I	II	III	IV	V	
1. Number of States in Initial 43-State Pool	29	25	31	19	15	43
2. Number Remaining Eligible After Selection of On-Site Sample	26	20	29	15	9	42
3. Number Solicited for Mail Questionnaire Participation	20	20	20	14	9	41
4. Number Unable to Participate	3	3	1	2	3	5
5. Number Receiving Mail Questionnaires	17	17	19	12	6	36
6. Number Successful Team Completions[a] [b]	13	17	14	11	4	33

[a] "Successful" team completion was defined as requiring that (a) Background Information and Job Activities Inventory sections of the questionnaire booklet be completed and (b) not more than one team member's booklet be missing or incomplete. Also, if the counselor's booklet was missing or incomplete, the team's returns were considered "unsuccessfully" completed.

[b] Rate of return was 83%. The total number of locations sent questionnaires was 71; with all office-type categories combined, the total number of successful team completions was 59.

two-fold: (a) the Background Information and the Job Activities Inventory, (JAI) sections of the booklet had to be completed, and (b) not more than one team member's booklet could be missing or incomplete, with the added restriction that if the counselor's booklet was missing or incomplete, the team's returns were considered unsuccessfully completed. Using these criteria, the overall successful rate of return for teams (or locations) was 83%. Of the 59 teams considered to have "successful completions," 43 (73%) represented full team-member returns while the remaining 27% were missing one team member.

The rule of accepting team returns as "successfully completed" even when one member's questionnaire was missing was based on a review of site-visit experience. During these visits, it was found that 22% of the teams had a team-member position vacant because of recent reassignment or termination of employment, accidents, or serious illness. Thus, considering only the 59 teams identified as "successful completions," the incidence of teams with one missing team member is comparable to expectations from the site-visit experience.

The states and type of office locations within each state that received mail questionnaires, and the status of their returns as "successful" vs. "unsuccessful" completion, are shown in Table A-4. The totals reflect the number of office locations for only the "successful" completions. The "s" notation in certain cells designates those instances where one of the two or more available office locations appeared in the site-visit sample while a second location appeared in the mail-questionnaire sample.

Table A-4

Office-Type Locations That Received Mail Questionnaires, and Status of Returns

Location	Office Type[a]					Total Locations Successful Completions
	I	II	III	IV	V	
REGION I						
Maine	–	x	0	0	0	1
Massachusetts	–	x s	x s	x s	0	3
Rhode Island	0	0	–	x	0	1
Vermont	x	0	0	0	0	1
REGION II						
New Jersey	*	–	–	–	–	0
New York	0	0	x	x s	*	3
REGION III						
Maryland	x	0	*	0	x	2
Pennsylvania	x s	x s	x s	0	–	3
Virginia	0	x	–	x	0	2
West Virginia	x s	–	x s	0	0	2
REGION IV						
Florida	0	x	x	x	0	3
Georgia	0	x	x	0	0	2
Kentucky	x s	–	–	0	–	1
Mississippi	–	0	*	0	0	0
North Carolina	0	x	x	0	0	2
South Carolina	*	0	–	0	0	0
Tennessee	x	0	x	x s	0	3
REGION V						
Illinois	0	–	–	x s	x s	2
Minnesota	–	0	–	x	0	1
Ohio	x s	x s	–	*	–	2
Wisconsin	*	x	x	0	*	2
REGION VI						
Arkansas	x	x	x	0	0	3
Louisiana	–	x s	x s	–	0	2
New Mexico	x	0	0	x	0	2
Oklahoma	x	0	*	0	0	1
Texas	0	0	–	x	0	1
REGION VII						
Iowa	–	x s	*	0	0	1
Kansas	x	0	*	0	0	1
Missouri	0	0	0	0	x s	1
Nebraska	0	x	0	–	0	1

(Continued)

Table A-4 *(Continued)*

Office-Type Locations That Received Mail Questionnaires, and Status of Returns

Location	Office Type[a]					Total Locations Successful Completions
	I	II	III	IV	V	
REGION VIII						
Colorado	x s	0	x s	0	—	2
Montana	—	x	0	0	0	1
North Dakota	—	x	0	0	0	1
South Dakota	x	x	0	0	0	2
REGION IX						
Arizona	0	0	x	—	—	1
California	*	x s	x s	x s	x	4
Total Locations Successful Completions	13	17	14	11	4	59

[a] x: indicates successful completion of mail questionnaire data collection by one team at one location of the given office type.

s: indicates instances in which a different office location of the same type was contained in the site-visit sample.

—: indicates that state had one or more office locations of that type, but they were not identified for data collection.

0: indicates state did not have office locations of given type.

*: indicates office location selected but failed to successfully complete mail questionnaires. These locations are not included in Table totals.

The extent of overlap of the two samples by state is shown in Table A-5 for each office type and for states without regard for office type. In Table A-5, it is shown that of the 35 states from which data were collected (right-hand column, sum of Lines 1, 2, and 3), 15 (Line 2) provided data for both samples. For each office type, for example, of the 18 states providing Office Type I locations (Office Type I, sum of Lines 1, 2, and 3), five provided these exclusively for the site-visit sample (Line 1); eight provided Type I locations exclusively for the mail sample (Line 3); and five other states provided two Office Type I locations each, one for the site-visit sample and one for the mail sample. Thus, a total of 10 states provided site locations, and 13 states provided mail questionnaire locations. Lines 4 and 5 of Table A-5 describe the extent to which all eligible states in the 43-state pool were represented in the final data collection for each sample.

TEAM IDENTIFICATION FOR DATA COLLECTION

Once a local office location was identified, the next step was to identify the team (and its membership) from which data would be collected. An "advance" questionnaire (Appendix B) sent to office supervisors was used to accomplish this for both the site-visit and the mail samples. In the single-team offices, the team identity was established when the office location was identified, and all that remained was to identify the individual team members. For multi-team offices, the "advance" questionnaire requested office supervisors to list, alphabetically by last name, the senior member of each team. They were then asked to identify, for the data collection, the team with the senior member's

Table A-5

State Office Locations Used From Pool of 43 States for Site-Visit and Mail Samples

Item	Office Type					Total States Represented
	I	II	III	IV	V	
1. Number of states, site-visit only	5	5	5	5	7	2
2. Number of states, both site-visit and mail questionnaires	5	6	6	5	2	15
3. Number of states, mail questionnaire only	8	11	8	6	2	18
4. State-Visit Sample						
Number of states in sample	10	11	11	10	9	17
Number of states possible from 43-state pool	29	25	31	19	15	43
Percent of possible states in sample	34	44	35	53	60	40
5. Mail Sample						
Number of states in sample	13	17	14	11	4	33
Number of states eligible for consideration	26	20	29	15	9	42
Percent of eligible states in sample	50	85	48	73	44	78

name appearing in a prescribed position on the list. One of four list positions—first, second, next-to-last, and last—has previously been entered on the questionnaire by the research staff. The particular list position entered on a questionnaire was determined by random assignment.

After identifying the team (and its individual members) that would participate in data collection, the supervisor was asked to review an accompanying list of major WIN team functions, and then to indicate whether any of the functions were normally performed for this team's enrollees by staff or agencies not identified as team members. If there were such functions, the supervisor was asked to check them and identify, in each case, a nonteam member who performed that function for the team's enrollees. In the remainder of the report, the nonteam members identified in this fashion will be referred to as "specialized services" staff.

This procedure permitted two definitions of a WIN "team": (a) the names of the members identified by the office supervisor as constituting a "team", and (b) the group that provides the full range of WIN services provided by that office to a common caseload of enrollees. The latter definition identifies a WIN team as comprising those listed as team members plus representatives of any specialized services normally providing certain caseload services for the same enrollees. This was considered important because it was not known to what extent certain WIN caseload services (e.g., orientation, job development, and placement) would be handled by the regular Employment Service staff or contracted to outside agencies.

Upon return of the "advance" questionnaire, a roster was prepared for each team listing team members by name and job position. Use of this roster will be described in reporting data collection procedures followed with each type of sample.

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

SITE-VISIT SAMPLE

Data were collected at 51 offices by seven members of the HumRRO research staff working concurrently at different office locations. Data collection was initiated the last week of December 1970, and scheduled for completion February 12, 1971. However, the necessity for rescheduling six office locations resulted in extending the data collection period to March 2, 1971.

Data collection at each site-visit office consisted of the following:

1. (1) Interview with the WIN office supervisor.
2. (2) Interview with the team leader.
3. (3) Administration of the Work Activities Inventory (WAI), a four-part questionnaire, to each team member.

MAIL-QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLE

Data collection from the mail sample was restricted to the questionnaires contained in the Work Activities Inventory.

The "advance" questionnaire, filled out by the WIN office supervisor and returned to the research staff, served to identify the team and individual team members who would participate in the mail sample. Packets of WAIs were then made up for each local office. These packets included a cover letter to the WIN office supervisor and for each respondent, a letter of explanation, a questionnaire booklet, a team roster, and an envelope for use in returning the completed questionnaire.

Procedures were set up to protect the respondent's anonymity in the event that this was a matter of individual concern (the cooperation of regional, state, and local officials was also requested in this regard). Respondents in both the site-visit and the mail samples were requested not to put their names on the WAI booklet. The individual respondent's booklet was identified by serial numbers stamped on the front of each booklet and keyed to a team roster that remained in the research files.

In the site-visit sample, the HumRRO staff member administered the WAI to the team members, and thus was able to ensure the correspondence between booklet number and identity of the respondent. For the mail sample, a strip of paper bearing the individual's name was stapled to the front of the booklet. Team members were instructed to remove the strip of paper before returning the booklet, place the booklet in the envelope provided, and seal it for return to the research staff.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVIEWS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

WIN OFFICE SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW

The interview with the WIN office supervisor, based upon a semistructured interview outline, required about one hour. The purpose of the interview was to obtain information regarding (a) the organizational structure and the staffing of the WIN portion of the office; (b) office policies in assigning responsibility for caseload services; (c) types of records kept on enrollee employability goals, failures, and achievements for a given team; (d) WIN staff hiring requirements; and (e) inservice training policies and practices. In addition, summary enrollment statistics were sought for the particular team scheduled to participate in the research. These caseload activity figures (number referred to team, number terminated, and number currently enrolled) were intended for use as an index of the teams' caseload experience. The interviewer's outline and recording forms are contained in Appendix C.

Information obtained from these interviews regarding structure and staffing of the WIN office was used to verify and, as necessary, update the data collection plans (identification of team and team-member study participants) that had been made for a given office approximately two months before the visit. The portion of the interview concerning caseload activity figures did not produce usable data. Caseload activity figures for the participating team were frequently unavailable. While there are a number of contributing factors that vary widely in importance from office to office, the main reason these data were not available is that data reporting systems focus on the project, not the team, as the basic reporting unit.

Pilot efforts to generate these data in three different offices indicated that this would require shifting the focus of the study to these data and approximately doubling the data collection effort. Generating the data from the local office files entailed screening all terminated files accumulated since the office had been in existence in order to identify enrollments or terminations that had taken place during a given period of time. In multi-team offices, there was the additional problem of determining which team had worked with the enrollee.

TEAM-LEADER INTERVIEW

An interview requiring approximately one hour was conducted with the team leader or a senior member of the same team who responded to the WAI. The purpose was to obtain information regarding the ways in which the team functioned in making decisions and providing services to the client at various stages of the enrollment process. The semistructured interview was carried out in accordance with the interviewer's outline contained in Appendix D.

Interviews were analyzed for the team's style of functioning in making decisions regarding three major client decision points: enrollment, initial assignment, and identification of employability plan goals. In considering these major client decisions, four characteristics of the team's style of decision functioning were identified and scored:

1. Decisions made separately or conjointly in time
    a. Each decision accomplished at a separate point in time
    b. Enrollment and initial assignment decisions made conjointly at time of enrollment interview; Employability plan goals identified at a later point in time
    c. Enrollment decision made separately; at a later point in time Initial Assignment and Employability plan goals decided conjointly
    d. All three decisions made conjointly at time of enrollment interview
2. Alternatives used at enrollment and initial assignment for the "not-job-ready"
    a. Enrollment decision alternatives (Yes or No)
        (1) All referrals must be enrolled: scored "no"
        (2) Referrals can be returned to Welfare as "inappropriate": scored "yes"
    b. Initial assignment alternatives (Yes or No)
        (1) All enrollees considered "not-job-ready" go to Orientation: scored "no"

(2) Among enrollees considered "not-job-ready," some are initially assigned to Orientation, some to on-the-job or other training: scored "yes"

3. Number of team members having contact with client prior to the decision
   a. One: scored "single"
   b. Two or more: scored "multiple"
4. Team style of interaction in accomplishing the decision
   a. Decision made by single individual without team conference
   b. Decision made in team conference

The interviews were scored independently by the two senior staff members. Reliability of scoring was estimated by tallying (for each scoring category separately) the number of teams with a score that the two judges had agreed upon. Percent agreement indexes (Table A-6) were then computed by expressing the number of teams judges had agreed upon as percent of the total number (50) of teams. While site visits were carried out at 51 team locations, interview data from one of the Office Type II locations were not considered complete enough for scoring, so data from this team were eliminated from the analyses covered in the present report.

Table A-6

Interview Analysis—Indexes of Scorer Agreement

Scoring Category	Scorer Agreements (% of 50 Teams)
1. Decisions made separately or conjointly in time	74
2. Decision and action alternatives used	
Enrollment	82
Initial assignment	88
3. Multiple vs. single team-member contact with client prior to decision	
Enrollment	84
Initial assignment	80
Employability plan	70
4. Team style of interacting in accomplishing decision	
Enrollment	88
Initial assignment	88
Employability plan	86

In the analyses presented in this report, the four characteristics or attributes of team decision functioning were used to describe team decision process styles. This required developing a rationale for assigning numerical weights to the characteristics so as to produce a total score that would rank teams in terms of continuum of style of functioning. This rationale is presented in Chapter 2 of this report. Briefly, it involved describing two models of team functioning seen as representing opposite ends of a continuum concerned with extent of decision-making communication and coordinations among team members. The "team-process" model at one extreme describes team members practicing a closely integrated style of decision making; the "specialist-process" model at the other extreme describes decision making centered on the individual specialist with no decision-making communication or coordination taking place among team members. These reference models were used in developing premises regarding the relative weighting to be used within each of the four interview scoring categories. These premises are described in the following section, and the resulting score weighting for each category is presented in Table A-7.

Weights were assigned so that the highest score was given the teams who displayed the greatest number of attributes most closely aligned with the "team-process" end of the continuum. A total Style of Decision Functioning score (DF) was obtained by summing the team's scores on the four characteristics, weighted as described in Table A-7. The possible score range of the DF score is from 0 to 16. Analyses in the present report will use both the DF score and its four component scores.

The premises used in weighting interview-scoring categories are described as follows:

(1) Time Phasing of Decision Points: Decisions made separately or conjointly in time. Developing plans that are individually tailored to meet enrollee needs and labor market opportunities requires that team members develop close rapport with the enrollee, become well acquainted with the enrollee's aspirations and needs, and be able to recognize changes in aspirations and needs that may occur during the employability development process. These objectives require interaction with the enrollee, over a period of time, prior to identification of employability plan goals used as a basis for referral to specific job-related training. Time-phasing involving all three decisions made at separate points in time provides the most opportunity for team-member interaction with the enrollee prior to decision making. In addition, it is of special importance that decision making regarding employability plan goals be separate in time from the other decision points to permit team-member interaction with the enrollee prior to this decision. The resulting rank-order weighting system for time-phasing of decision points is shown in Table A-7.

(2) Decision and Action Alternatives Used at Enrollment and Initial Assignment for the Not-Job-Ready. For a team to individually tailor employability development plans to meet the enrollee's needs and labor market opportunities, it must have the option of decision and action alternatives when making decisions regarding enrollment, initial assignment, and, of course, employability plan goals. Because of mandatory enrollment policies affecting many of the WIN referrals, it was decided to concentrate score weighting on initial assignment alternatives, leaving it possible to still use the score weight to identify the teams that did and did not have decision and action options at enrollment. The resulting weighting system is shown in Table A-7.

(3) Number of Team Members Having Decision-Related Contact With the Client Prior to the Decision. The basic premises for this scoring were presented under "Time Phasing of Decision Points." This scoring of team-member contacts reflects the extent to which the team used whatever opportunities their time-phasing allowed for only single vs. multiple team member-client contacts. The resultant weighting system, similar to that used with time-phasing, is presented in Table A-7.

(4) Team Style of Interaction in Accomplishing the Decision. Close coordination and communication among team members is enhanced through use of team conferences. Team conferences tied to decision making for each decision point separately are assumed to give the greatest opportunity for closely integrated team functioning in decision making. In addition, special importance is given to the use of team conference in making decisions regarding employability plan goals. As in the weighting for time-phasing of decision points, additional weight is given when employability plan decisions are made at a separate point in time from other decisions. The specific score weighting scheme is shown in Table A-7.

Table A-7

Score Weights Used in Scoring the Four Components of the Style of Decision Functioning (DF) Score

Style of Decision Functioning	Score Weight	Bonus Weight
1. Time-Phasing of Decision Points (DT). Enrollment, initial assignment, and employability plan goal decisions made separately or conjointly in time.		
a. Each accomplished at separate point in time	2	
b. Decisions accomplished at two points in time	1	
c. All accomplished at same points in time	0	
Plus bonus weights as follows:		
Employability plan decisions made conjointly with one or both of the other decisions		0
Employability plan decision made at a separate point in time		1
2. Alternative used at enrollment and initial assignment (Alt).		
a. Alternatives used in relation to both decisions	2	
b. Alternative used in relation to one of the two decisions	1	
c. Alternatives not used in relation to either decision	0	
Plus bonus weights as follows:		
Alternatives used in relation to initial assignment decision		1
3. Number of team members having decision-relevant contact with client prior to making the decision (MC).		
a. Three decisions made at separate points in time; multiple contacts prior to each decision	3	
b. Multiple contacts made prior to two decision points	2	
c. Multiple contacts made prior to one decision point	1	
d. Multiple contacts never made prior to a decision point	0	
Plus bonus weights as follows:		
Employability plan decisions made at separate point in time and preceded by multiple contacts relevant to this decision		2
Employability plan decision made conjointly with one or both of the other two decisions but preceded by multiple team member contacts		1
4. Use of team conferences in decision making (TC).		
a. Three team conferences (all three decisions made at separate points of time and, in each case, during team conference).	3	
b. Two team conferences (at least two of the three decisions made at separate points in time and, in each case during team conference).	2	
c. One team conference (regardless of the pattern of decision timing only one decision point involved team conference).	1	
d. No use of team conference (regardless of pattern of decision timing, decision making was always accomplished by one individual without team conference)	0	
Plus bonus weights as follows:		
Employability plan decisions made during separate team conference		2
Employability plan decisions made in conjunction with one or both of the other decisions but in team conference		1

WORK ACTIVITIES INVENTORY (WAI)

The Work Activities Inventory (WAI) was administered to each member of the team and, where applicable, to representatives selected from specialized services staff. The inventory comprises four separate sections: (a) Background Information; (b) Job Activities Inventory (JAI); (c) Major Caseload Functions; and (d) Major Caseload Decision Areas. The WAI required from one to two hours to complete. A copy is contained in Appendix E.

WAI Background Information Section

The Background Information section of the WAI contains 20 items aimed at providing information regarding the respondent's present Employment Service job classification, his present WIN team member position, months of experience in this position, months at present location, months as staff of the WIN program, prior job experience, educational background, and in-service training received relevant to his present job position.

Classification of individuals into team-member job positions in the analyses reported in Chapter 3 was based upon individual responses to Item 7 of the Background Information section. Education, experience, and in-service training information were intended for use as classification variables in examining duties and tasks performed by job positions and teams.

The WAI Job Activities Inventory

The Job Activities Inventory (JAI), which constitutes the major portion of the Work Activities Inventory, consists of 82 task statements classified into 10 major duty areas. The respondents were asked to first read through the full list of tasks and check those that they personally performed as a normal part of the job. They were then asked to go back through the tasks they had checked and to rate, on a 1 to 5 scale, the relative amount of time spent on each task, compared to the other tasks checked. These instructions were modeled after a relative time rating procedure described by Morsh and Archer (8).

A basic premise of the present study was that the major frame of reference to be used in studying implementation of the WIN team concept was that provided by the program concepts outlined in the WIN Handbook. Under this approach, duties and tasks in the JAI were developed to represent a detailed outline of the model for WIN team functioning. Thus, the first step is to identify the major duties or functions the team is expected to perform, and the next is to identify the major tasks essential to accomplishing each major duty. Once the classification of major duties is considered acceptable, the criterion for inclusion or exclusion of tasks becomes the decision as to whether different task statements represent separate activities that are generally essential to the accomplishment of the duty area. To the extent that these judgments are correct, the number of task statements in a given duty area reflects the number of distinguishable activities necessary to perform the duty.

Following this rationale, the orientation of the JAI is toward the duties and tasks the team is expected to perform rather than toward development of detailed descriptions for each presently identified job position. Thus, in looking at the final data, two questions arise: (a) Which of these duties and tasks, considered important to the WIN team concept, are performed by one or more members of the team? (b) Of the duties and tasks performed by the team, what is the contribution of each of the current five job positions?

Duty areas and task statements for the JAI were developed primarily from a detailed screening of the WIN Handbook. Descriptions were written of each separate activity that was expected to be performed at the team staff level. These statements were then reviewed by the research staff and grouped into tentative duty area clusters. Through the cooperation of the California State WIN sponsor, permission was obtained to discuss and review these statements and their tentative duty cluster identifications with staffs of two WIN offices—a five-team office in a large SMSA and a single-team office in a small SMSA. As a result of these reviews, revisions were made in duty area identifications and task statements.

A tryout form that also included the relative time rating instructions was then constructed. Again, with the cooperation of the California WIN sponsor, this inventory and tentative forms of the other data collection techniques were administered at two office locations. One was the same five-team site, but with a different staff from the one that assisted in the initial review; the second location was a one-team site in a rural community. Interview discussions were held with team members and supervisors following both of these administrations. Revisions suggested by these reviews were primarily a matter of clarifying wording rather than adding to the task statements. The JAI was printed in its final form after the revisions were made.

Each individual's JAI was scored by adding the numerical values of the relative time ratings (1 to 5) he awarded to tasks performed. The relative time rating for each task was then expressed as its percentage of the total ratings for all tasks performed. The percentage scores for each task performed are referred to as the individual's "percent of total time" scores for the given task.

Because an individual's percent of total time scores add to 100%, such scores for duty areas can be obtained by adding the percent of total time scores for the individual tasks performed by that person within that area.

Estimates of the relative amount of time expended by the team as a whole in a given task or duty area were obtained by summing the respective task or duty area scores for all members of the team and dividing this sum by the total number of team members. Similarly, by grouping individuals by job position, estimates were made of the relative amount of total time expended by that job position in performing the particular task or duty area.

The WAI Major Caseload Functions Questionnaire

The third section of the WAI was a questionnaire designed to obtain data on the clarity of role communication among the members of the teams. It consisted of a list of 13 major functions that teams would be expected to accomplish in the course of providing employability development services to their enrollees. Each team member was asked to indicate the nature of his own and each of the other team members' involvement in accomplishing each of the caseload functions. For each individual on the team (including self) the respondent marked one of three responses: "Yes" to indicate the respondent perceived the person being rated as being directly involved in accomplishing the given function; "No" to indicate the respondent did not perceive the person as being directly involved; and "?" to indicate the respondent was uncertain as to whether the person was directly involved. In order to make these ratings, the respondent was provided with a team roster that also identified the column number to use in recording ratings for a given team member.

Three scores were obtained for each individual on each of the 13 items: the percent of a given respondent's fellow team members who agreed with the particular respondent's self-report response; the percent of fellow team members who disagreed; and the percent who expressed uncertainty regarding the given respondent's involvement in the particular function.

The WAI Major Caseload Decision Questionnaire

This questionnaire constituted the fourth, and final section of the WAI. It was intended to obtain data regarding the team's perception of the relative importance of each of the team members and the client in making decisions regarding the client's goals and the services to be provided. Each team member was asked to use a five-point rating scale to rate the importance of the role the client usually plays, that he or she plays (self-rating), and that each of the other team members plays in determining the decisions made in each of nine decision areas. The five-point scale ranged from "1—Plays no part in decisions made in this area" to "5—Makes decisions in this area by himself." As in the case of the Major Caseload Functions questionnaire, a team roster identified each of the response columns in the questionnaire with the name of a team member.

This questionnaire yielded two scores for each team member in each of the nine decision areas. The two scores were the individual's self-rating on each decision area, and the average rating attributed to the individual by the other team members on each of the nine areas. Client importance in decision making was scored by computing the average rating given the client by all team members in each of the nine areas.

Appendix B

ADVANCE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ON-SITE DATA COLLECTION

Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO), Division No. 3
P. O. Box 5787, Presidio of Monterey, California 93940

TO: Supervisors of Local WIN Offices

The purpose of this questionnaire procedure is to enable us to identify in advance, the individual WIN staff members in your office whose cooperation we will need in completing a work activities inventory. Only certain sections of this questionnaire will apply to your office. Information given in the questions below will guide you to the appropriate sections. Directions for forwarding the completed form are provided in the attached cover letter from your State WIN office. Thank you for your assistance.

* * * * * *

I. In the organization of your office are there WIN staff members whom you would identify as belonging to a particular Team? YES _____ NO _____

If "NO" answer the questions in Section D, page 6.

II. If there are WIN staff members in your office that you identify as belonging to a particular WIN team, and if these members form

A. ONLY ONE WIN TEAM, physically located in your office, answer the questions in Sections A & C, pages 2 & 4.

B. TWO OR MORE WIN TEAMS, physically located in your office, answer the questions in Sections B & C, pages 3 & 4.

III. Complete the information requested above and then fill in the information requested in Section E, page 8.

SECTION A: To be filled in by Offices with ONLY ONE WIN TEAM

1. For each person serving on this WIN Team, list his name, job position and number of months he has been on this Team.

	Name	Job Position	No. Months on Team
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			

SECTION B: To be filled in by Offices with TWO OR MORE WIN TEAMS

1. How many WIN Teams are physically located in your office? ________________ (number of Teams)

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING PROCESS IN SELECTING THE WIN TEAM TO WHOM WE WILL ADMINISTER QUESTIONNAIRES

2. On a separate sheet of paper, list alphabetically, by last name, the person on each Team designated as that Team's Leader. If a Team does not have a designated Leader, list the person you would consider as the senior member of the Team because of job position or experience.

3. Using this alphabetical listing, select the person who appears ________ on the list. This person, and the members of his Team, are the ones to whom we would like to administer our questionnaires.

4. For each person serving on the WIN Team selected by the process above, list below his name, job position, and number of months he has been on this Team. Please list the Team Leader or senior member first.

	Name	Job Position	No. Months in Position
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			

SECTION C: To be filled in by all offices completing Sections A and B

On page 9 is a list of fifteen major caseload functions performed in working with WIN Clients. Detach page 9 and use this list as a guide in answering the questions below.

1. Do the members you have identified as a WIN Team perform all of the functions listed on page 9 for their caseload?

   _____ YES (If YES, skip the rest of this section and go on to Section E, page 8.)

   _____ NO (If NO, continue answering the questions below.)

2. Which of the functions listed on page 9 are not normally performed by the previously identified Team members? Circle the item numbers corresponding to the appropriate caseload functions as listed on page 9.

   Caseload Function #: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

3. Who performs the functions you described above (question 2) for clients of the identified WIN Team?
   Enter in the spaces below the name, job position, number of months in job position, and functions performed by each of these WIN staff members. Describe the functions each normally performs for this Team's clients by circling the appropriate item numbers reprinted below from the list on page 9.

Note: In the event that any one of several people may perform the same caseload function for clients of this WIN Team, list only one of those who perform that particular function.

If certain caseload functions are not performed by your WIN staff but, instead, are performed by outside groups or agencies under agreement with your WIN office: In this case identify the outside agency under the column headed "Name;" indicate under "Months in Position" how long this agency has been performing this service for your office; and, circle the appropriate numbers to identify the caseload functions this agency performs for this Teams clients.

	Name	Job Position	No. Months in Position	Caseload Function Number
1.	____________	____________	____________	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
2.	____________	____________	____________	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
3.	____________	____________	____________	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
4.	____________	____________	____________	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

SECTION C: (Continued)

	Name	Job Position	No. Months in Position	Caseload Function Number
5.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
6.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
7.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
8.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
9.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
10.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

SECTION D: To be filled in by offices whose staff is not organized into groups identified as WIN Teams

On page 9 is a list of fifteen major caseload functions performed in working with WIN clients. Detach page 9 and use this list as a guide in providing the information requested below.

1. Using the list of functions as a guide, identify a set of staff members who would normally be involved in performing these different functions for the same client. Identify as many different staff members as would usually be involved in accomplishing these different functions for a particular client in your office.
2. Enter in the spaces below the name, job position, number of months in job position, and the functions which each of the staff members would normally be expected to perform for this particular client. Describe the functions each would be expected to perform by circling the appropriate item numbers reprinted below from the list on page 9.

Note: In the event that any one of several people may perform the same caseload function for a given client, list only one of those who normally perform that particular function.

If certain caseload functions are not performed by your WIN staff but, instead, are performed by outside groups or agencies under agreement with your WIN office: In this case identify the outside agency under the column headed "Name;" indicate under "Months in Position" how long this agency has been performing this service for your office; and, circle the appropriate numbers to identify the caseload functions this agency performs.

	Name	Job Position	No. Months in Position	Caseload Function Number
1.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
2.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
3.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
4.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
5.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
6.				1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

SECTIOM D: (Continued)

	Name	Job Position	No. Months in Position	Caseload Function Number
7.	______	______	______	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
8.	______	______	______	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
9.	______	______	______	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
10.	______	______	______	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

SECTION E: To be filled in by all WIN Offices

Person completing this form: ______________________________ ______________________________
Name Job Position/Title

Address: ____
Street or P.O. Box City State Zip Code

Phone Number: ____________________

Upon completion, please forward this questionnaire back to the research staff in accordance with the instructions provided by your State WIN Office. Thank you again for your assistance.

Richard P. Kern, Ph.D.
Project Director

Major WIN Team Functions

1. Receive and schedule referrals for enrollment
2. Enrollment of applicants
3. Assessment and identification of new enrollee's employability status and needs
4. Counseling
5. WIN Orientation
6. Special employability preparation (how to apply, job search, etc.)
7. Development of formal or informal employability plans
8. Referral of enrollees to appropriate education, training, and work experience components
9. Supervision of enrollee's progress while enrolled in WIN
10. Securing job placement of enrollee at appropriate time
11. Conducting Determinations
12. Locates facilities capable of providing the needed types of education, training, and job experience components
13. Location and/or development of job opportunities for current or future enrollees
14. Provides follow-up services to enrollees who have gained employment
15. Maintains a system of records on individual enrollees

Appendix C

INTERVIEWER OUTLINE AND DATA FORMS FOR THE WIN SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW

INTERVIEWER OUTLINE: Manager Interview

I. WIN Office Staffing and Organization.

1. How many WIN staff members are there in your office?

2. How many WIN Teams?

3. How are these teams staffed?

   (NOTES: *For one-team offices, simply verify primary team listing on your master roster.

   *For multi-team offices use Team Organization Sheet to record team member, job positions and number in each.)

   (a) Where, within an office, differences in team staffing exist, determine whether this is by design and if so, why?

   (b) Do members of this team (each team) work together on an assigned caseload? If not, explain variations.

4. Are there other WIN staff in this office who are not identified as members of a particular Team?

   (a) If Yes, who are they by job position and what is the nature of the other major functions they perform?

   (NOTE: Use the "non-team personnel" sheet to record job position or section title of personnel; number of personnel in each; and, nature of duties or functions performed.)

   (b) If I add the total number of Team personnel to the total number of "non-team personnel" will it add up to the total number of WIN staff in the office? If not, why not?

II. Caseload Assignment Procedure.

1. To whom is responsibility for providing program services for individual clients assigned? - to particular staff members? - to a team?

2. In multi-team offices, what factors determine which team a particular enrollee is assigned to?

3. What is the caseload limit for each Team (or Staff member) to whom this responsibility is assigned?

4. At what point after receipt of referral is responsibility for provision of services assigned?

III. Program Statistics

1. Does this office have or maintain any tabulations regarding stages in the program when failures in participation are most likely to occur? Any impressions?

2. Does this office have or maintain any tabulations regarding the types of employability-plan goals of its enrollees?

3. Does this office have or maintain any tabulations regarding the specific education, work and training components used by its enrollees?

4. Does this office have or maintain any tabulations regarding specific types of job placements accomplished?

5. Does this office maintain any of the above types of figures on the basis of teams?

IV. Staff Hiring Standards

1. Are the minimum hiring standards for all of the WIN staff positions established centrally by the State?

2. How do you proceed if you have a vacancy you wish to fill in each of the following WIN job positions?

   (a) Manpower or Job development specialist
   (b) Work and Training Specialist
   (c) Counselor
   (d) Coach
   (e) Clerk/stenographer

3. If hiring is centrally controlled, who is the person or agency we should contact to obtain a complete description of the hiring standards required for WIN staff positions in your state?

V. Staff Inservice Training

1. Have your WIN staff personnel received inservice training oriented specifically towards their WIN staff or Team functions?

   (a) If so, who conducted it (your own office; regional WIN office; State WIN office)?

   (b) What continuing inservice training provisions are there for your staff? (Who is to receive it?; at what points in time?; for what purpose? Who lays down the guidelines?; Who conducts it?)

   (c) If inservice training is centrally controlled, who is the person or agency we should contact to obtain a complete description of the inservice training program?

WIN Office Location ______________________ Date _____________

TEAM ORGANIZATION SHEET

Data Recording Sheet: Number of incumbents in each job position for each WIN Team physically located in this office.

Job Position	Team Identification: Team #													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
TEAM TOTAL														
GRAND TOTAL														

WIN Office Location ______________________ **Date** ______________________

NON-TEAM PERSONNEL SHEET

Data Recording Sheet: Number of non-team WIN staff, their job position, and duties

Job Position	# Staff	Major Caseload Functions Performed
		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
		Other
		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
		Other
		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
		Other
		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
		Other
		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
		Other
		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
		Other
		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
		Other
		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
		Other
		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
		Other

NON-TEAM STAFF TOTAL ____________

GENERAL INFORMATION

WIN OFFICE LOCATION ____________________ **Date** ____________________

WIN Project No. ________________ **No. Teams in Office** ________________

For use of ONE-TEAM and MULTI-TEAM OFFICES

I. REFERRALS

1. As of this date, what is the total number of referrals that have been made to this WIN Office since the beginning of the project?

____referrals Dates: From ____________ to ____________
Mo. Day Yr. Mo. Day Yr.

2. Using the same time period, how many of these referrals
a)_____have been actually enrolled in WIN?
b)_____are still waiting to be enrolled in WIN (deferred referrals)?
c)_____have been considered ineligible to enroll in WIN for whatever reason?

II. ENROLLED

1. As of this date, how many enrollees are currently enrolled in the WIN program? (Be sure that this number includes those enrollees currently in a suspense status.)

_____active enrollees

III. TERMINATIONS

1. As of this date, how many terminations does this office have? (Use the same time period used in referrals; if you are unable to get figures for that particular time period, be sure to record the reasons why and the time period used for terminations.)

_____terminations Dates: From ____________ to ____________
Mo. Day Yr. Mo. Day Yr.

FOR MULTI-TEAM OFFICE USE ONLY

IV. Of the total number of referrals made to this WIN Office since the start of this project, how many referrals has the Team you are dealing with actually enrolled in WIN as of this date? (Put down date the team began enrolling referees as a team.)

_____enrolled by this team since ____________
Mo. Day Yr.

V. As of this date, how many enrollees does the team you are dealing with have currently enrolled? (Be sure that this number includes those enrollees currently in a suspense status.)

_____active enrollees

VI. As of this date, how many terminations does the team you are dealing with have? (Put down date the team began terminating as a team.)

_____terminated by this team since ____________
Mo. Day Yr.

Appendix D

INTERVIEWER OUTLINE FOR THE TEAM LEADER OR SENIOR TEAM MEMBER INTERVIEW

INTERVIEWER OUTLINE: Team Leader or Experienced Team Member Interview

We are interested in getting a fuller description of the way in which your team functions in providing services to the client during the various stages of the program, starting from time of a client's referral and going through to the time he completes his employability plan.

Part I. Period extending from time of referral by Welfare, through enrollment, to the time the enrollee starts his initial assignment.

FIRST CONTACT

1. With whom does the client normally have his first face-to-face contact in this office?
2. What is the objective or function performed during this contact?
3. Is this the first contact for all clients?
   a. If not, what are the alternatives?
   b. What is the basis for deciding on one alternative versus another?
4. What decisions are made on the basis of this contact?
   a. Who makes these decisions and how?
   b. What actions may be taken on the basis of this contact?
5. Do the results of this contact determine selection of the client's next contact?
   a. If so, what are the alternative "next contacts"?
   b. What is the basis for selecting one alternative versus another?

SECOND CONTACT, THIRD CONTACT, ETC.

Note: Repeat the above cycle of questions as appropriate to trace in a sequential fashion, the contacts between the enrollee and the WIN Staff up until the time the enrollee starts his initial assignment (usually WIN Orientation). For each contact determine:

1. Job position identity of WIN Staff making the contact;
2. Purpose of the contact;
3. Contact routine for all clients; or, nature and type of contact dependent upon clients individual circumstances or characteristics? (describe)
4. Decisions made on basis of this contact - who makes them - how - these decisions lead to what courses of action?
5. Is next contact always the same regardless of results of this contact? If not, describe alternatives and basis for selection.

Part II. Period extending from Enrollee's start in Orientation to his start in his first education, work or job skill training component.

1. What type of contact, if any, does your team have with the enrollee while he is assigned to the Orientation component?
   - a. Which team member or members are normally involved in contacts with enrollees during the Orientation period?
   - b. Are these contacts initiated by the team members or by the enrollee?
   - c. What is the objective or function performed by these contacts?
   - d. Are contacts of the above types normally carried out with all enrollees during this period or only in special cases?
2. What types of decisions are made during this period regarding the enrollee's future assignment plans?
   - a. Who makes these decisions and how?
   - b. How is the enrollee informed of his future assignment plans?

Part III. Period extending from Enrollee's start in first Education, Training or Work Experience component to his eventual job placement.

1. What type of contact does your Team have with the enrollee while he is assigned to education, training or work experience components?; While he is in holding status between components?
   - a. Which team member or members are normally involved in contacts with the enrollee during his assignment to education, work or training components?; while he is in holding status between components?
   - b. Are these contacts initiated by team members or by the enrollee?
   - c. What is the objective or function performed by these contacts?
   - d. Are contacts of the above types normally carried out with all enrollees during this period or only when particular problems arise?
2. What types of decisions are made during this period regarding the enrollees program participation, employment preparation and job placement?
   - a. Who makes these decisions and how?
   - b. How is the enrollee informed of these plans or decisions?

Appendix E

WORK ACTIVITIES INVENTORY

Human Resources Research Organization
(HumRRO Division No. 3)
Monterey, California 93940

Work Activities Inventory

December 1970

Booklet No.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Do not write in this column

Questionnaire ID#:

1. ______________________________
WIN TEAM LOCATION (City & State)

What is the title and level used by the State to describe the job classification in which you are currently employed?

2. ______________________________
Job Classification Title

3. How long have you worked with the WIN program? _____ months

4. How long have you worked as a WIN staff member at your present office location? _____ months

5. Do you supervise other WIN staff? YES _____ NO _____

6. If you do supervise other WIN staff, check the titles which best describe this position:

_______ a. Do not supervise other WIN staff

_______ b. WIN Team coordinator for __________ WIN Teams
(how many)

_______ c. Leader of a WIN Team

_______ d. Leader of a specialized WIN services section

_______ e. Other (explain) ______________________________

7. Which of the following job titles best identifies your present WIN position? (Check only one; if none apply, enter your present job title in the write-in space provided).

_______ a. Coach

_______ b. Counselor

_______ c. Job Developer

_______ d. Caseload Manager

_______ e. Work Training Specialist

_______ f. Clerk-Stenographer

_______ g. Other (explain) ______________________________

Go on to Next Page

Do not write in this column

8. In terms of the way the WIN staff in your office is organized, are you considered (check one):

________ a. a member of a WIN Team

________ b. a member of a WIN Team and also a member of a specialized WIN services group

________ c. NOT a member of a WIN Team but one who provides specialized services to assist the WIN Team or Teams

9. If you are identified as a member of a WIN Team, how long have you performed in your current team position?

________ a. months in current Team job position

________ b. not a member of WIN Team

10. Have you previously filled other WIN Team job positions? If so what were these positions and how many months did you serve in each? (Cite most recent one first, next most recent second, etc.)

________ a. Have not held prior WIN Team job positions

________ b. Have held prior WIN Team job positions as:

________________________ ________
Prior Team job position No. of months

________________________ ________
Prior Team job position No. of months

11. Who was your employer just prior to the time you joined the WIN program staff?

____
Name of Company or Agency

12. How long were you employed by this company or agency?

________ years, ________ months.

13. What was your last position with this company or agency?

____
Job position or description

Go on to Next Page

Do not write in this column

14. Have you had any job experience, prior to working with WIN, that you consider of direct assistance in helping you to perform your duties in your current staff position?

________ a. No, none of direct assistance

________ b. Yes, as a ______________________________
Job position

Major Duties: ______________________________

____

Employer: ______________________________

Describe your educational background by checking the items below which apply to you. Fill in additional information requested as appropriate to your background.

15. High School

________ a. Did not complete high school

________ b. Completed high school or equivalent

16. College

________ a. Did not attend college

________ b. Attended a junior college

________ c. Attended a 4-year college

________ d. Graduated from a 4-year college

________ e. If you attended college, what was your area of study?

____

17. Graduate School

________ a. Attended but did not complete advanced degree requirements

________ b. Completed advanced degree requirements. Received a

______________ in ______________________________
Type of degree — Subject area

Go on to Next Page

Do not write in this column

18. **Since joining the WIN staff, have you received training which you consider directly relevant to your current WIN job duties?**

________ **a. No, none directly relevant**

________ **b. Yes (please describe below):**

Nature/purpose of training ________________

____

Agency conducting training ________________

Date received training ________________
Month Year

19. **Since joining the WIN staff have you received any other type of training related to the WIN program?**

________ **a. No, have not received any other training**

________ **b. Yes (please describe below):**

Nature/purpose of training ________________

____

Agency conducting training ________________

Date received training ________________
Month Year

20. **What training have you had *prior to joining the WIN staff* that you feel was of assistance in preparing you for job positions on the WIN staff?**

________ **a. No training of assistance**

________ **b. Yes (please describe below):**

Nature/purpose of training ________________

____

Related WIN position ________________

Agency conducting training ________________

Date received training ________________
Month Year

Go on to Next Page

JOB ACTIVITIES INVENTORY

This inventory contains lists of tasks considered necessary to the accomplishment of major duties performed by WIN Teams. Each major duty is printed in capital letters and followed by the tasks (the numbered items) thought to be important to the accomplishment of that major duty.

You are asked to respond to two questions regarding the tasks listed under these major duties.

FIRST QUESTION: *Which of the tasks listed under each major duty do you personally perform?*

Answer this question first. Read through all of the items in this inventory and indicate each of the tasks you personally perform as a normal or usual part of your job. To indicate each of the tasks you perform, place a check mark after the task in the column headed " ✓ if you do".

Go through the entire inventory answering this question before going on to the second question described below.

SECOND QUESTION: *How is your time distributed over the different tasks you perform?*

Start at the beginning of the inventory again and consider only those tasks which you have checked. Rate "Time Spent" by using the five-point rating scale to answer the following question for each task you perform:

How much time do you spend on the task you are rating compared to the amount of time you spend on each of the other tasks you perform?

1– much less time
2– slightly less time
3– same amount as most others
4– slightly greater amount
5– much greater amount

For example, if you feel you spend about the same amount of time on a particular task you are rating as you spend on most of the other tasks you perform, you would circle the number "3" next to that task in the column headed "Time Spent".

Go on to Next Page

Listed below are a duty and the tasks which it includes. Please check all tasks which you perform. When you have finished this, go back and rate each task checked for amount of time you spend on it compared to the time spent on each of the other tasks you perform.

	√ if you do	Time Spent 1—much less time 2—slightly less time 3—same amount as on most others 4—slightly greater amount 5—much greater amount

RECEIVES AND PROCESSES WELFARE DEPARTMENT REFERRAL FORMS.

1. Reviews referral forms to identify applicant's enrollment priority and to determine need for additional information prior to scheduling.		1 2 3 4 5
2. Contacts Welfare if additional information is needed regarding a referral.		1 2 3 4 5
3. Evaluates, on basis of referral information whether or not applicant can be considered appropriate for scheduling for enrollment at that time.		1 2 3 4 5
4. Notifies Welfare of referrals considered inappropriate for enrollment under their existing circumstances.		1 2 3 4 5
5. Schedules referrals for enrollment interview and notifies applicant and Welfare Department.		1 2 3 4 5
6. Notifies Welfare when an applicant does not appear for an enrollment interview.		1 2 3 4 5
7. Maintains records on referrals received.		1 2 3 4 5

ACCOMPLISHES ENROLLMENT AND INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF APPLICANT.

8. Conducts enrollment interview with applicant.		1 2 3 4 5
9. Decides on the appropriateness of enrollment on the basis of the additional information obtained during the enrollment interview.		1 2 3 4 5
10. Completes enrollment of applicants considered appropriate for enrollment.		1 2 3 4 5

Go on to Next Page

Listed below are a duty and the tasks which it includes. Please check all tasks which you perform. When you have finished this, go back and rate each task checked for amount of time you spend on it compared to the time spent on each of the other tasks you perform.	√ If you do	Time Spent 1—much less time 2—slightly less time 3—same amount as on most others 4—slightly greater amount 5—much greater amount

ACCOMPLISHES ENROLLMENT AND INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF APPLICANT (Continued).

11. Discusses with applicant who refuses enrollment his reasons for refusing and explains possible consequences of refusal.	☐	1	2	3	4	5
12. Schedules applicant who continues to refuse enrollment for a Determination decision.	☐	1	2	3	4	5
13. Refers applicants interviewed and considered not appropriate candidates for enrollment back to Welfare Department.	☐	1	2	3	4	5
14. Identifies new enrollee as job ready.	☐	1	2	3	4	5
15. Identifies new enrollee as requiring education, training, and/or special employability orientation services.	☐	1	2	3	4	5

ACCOMPLISHES INITIAL ASSIGNMENT OF ENROLLEE.

16. Develops initial assignment plans for a new enrollee.	☐	1	2	3	4	5
17. Refers new enrollees considered employable to job placement service.	☐	1	2	3	4	5
18. Arranges for new enrollees to be enrolled in WIN Orientation.	☐	1	2	3	4	5
19. Refers new enrollees for further, more extensive, vocational assessment.	☐	1	2	3	4	5
20. Refers new enrollees possessing employable skills but exhibiting special employability problems to special employment preparation sessions.	☐	1	2	3	4	5

Go on to Next Page

Listed below are a duty and the tasks which it includes. Please check all tasks which you perform. When you have finished this, go back and rate each task checked for amount of time you spend on it compared to the time spent on each of the other tasks you perform.	√ If you do	Time Spent 1—much less time 2—slightly less time 3—same amount as on most others 4—slightly greater amount 5—much greater amount
ASSISTS ENROLLEE IN DEVELOPING VOCATIONAL GOALS AND PLANS FOR ATTAINING THESE GOALS.		
21. Plans or assists in planning and conducting WIN Orientation sessions.		1 2 3 4 5
22. Conducts sessions with enrollees to assist them in identifying and coping with attitudes and habits which are likely to interfere with attainment of employment goals.		1 2 3 4 5
23. Determines which assessment procedure or techniques will be appropriate for use with a particular enrollee.		1 2 3 4 5
24. Arranges for administration of the selected assessment tests or procedures.		1 2 3 4 5
25. Administers standard tests and other assessment procedures to enrollees.		1 2 3 4 5
26. Interprets the results of standard tests and other assessment procedures in terms of their implications for the future plans of the individual enrollee.		1 2 3 4 5
27. Reviews work history, educational achievement, and job related aptitudes with individual enrollee in relation to possible training and vocational goals.		1 2 3 4 5
28. Identifies employability goals appropriate to the enrollee.		1 2 3 4 5
29. Determines the specific educational, work, and/or training components to which the enrollee will be assigned.		1 2 3 4 5
30. Makes arrangements for the enrollee to obtain the education, training, work experience, or job placement services appropriate to his employability plan.		1 2 3 4 5

Go on to Next Page

Listed below are a duty and the tasks which it includes. Please check all tasks which you perform. When you have finished this, go back and rate each task checked for amount of time you spend on it compared to the time spent on each of the other tasks you perform.	✓ If you do	Time Spent 1—much less time 2—slightly less time 3—same amount as on most others 4—slightly greater amount 5—much greater amount
ASSISTS ENROLLEE IN OBTAINING NEEDED SERVICES AND SUPERVISES HIS PROGRESS DURING ENROLLMENT.		
31. Coordinates with Welfare representative to assist enrollee in obtaining aid and services required to enable him to continue to participate in the program.		1 2 3 4 5
32. Contacts individual enrollees to determine whether or not they are receiving aid and services for which arrangements were made.		1 2 3 4 5
33. Monitors enrollee's attendance and progress in achievement during enrollment in education, training, or work experience components.		1 2 3 4 5
34. Contacts individual enrollees who have missed appointments or failed to attend education, training, or work experience sessions, to determine reason for non-attendance.		1 2 3 4 5
35. Discusses with enrollee his refusal to accept assignment or his failure to participate in component and explains possible consequences of continued refusal to participate.		1 2 3 4 5
36. Discusses with enrollee his failure or refusal to accept referral to employment or to accept employment offered and explains possible consequences of continued failure or refusal.		1 2 3 4 5
37. Schedules enrollees who fail to participate or fail to accept employment referrals or employment offers for Determination decision.		1 2 3 4 5
38. Determines through periodic reassessment of individual enrollees' status and progress, whether or not there is need for revision of the individual's employability plan.		1 2 3 4 5
39. Modifies or reorients enrollee's employability plan and the services provided on the basis of decisions made during reassessment of his progress.		1 2 3 4 5
40. Provides regular follow-up services for enrollees who have obtained job positions.		1 2 3 4 5

[illegible] to Next Page

Listed below are a duty and the tasks which it includes. Please check all tasks which you perform. When you have finished this, go back and rate each task checked for amount of time you spend on it compared to the time spent on each of the other tasks you perform.	√ If you do	Time Spent 1—much less time 2—slightly less time 3—same amount as on most others 4—slightly greater amount 5—much greater amount

ASSISTS ENROLLEE IN OBTAINING NEEDED SERVICES AND SUPERVISES HIS PROGRESS DURING ENROLLMENT (Continued).

41. Provides intensive follow-up services for enrollees who have obtained job positions.		1 2 3 4 5
42. Identifies and refers for termination enrollees who have proven unable to progress sufficiently to make further utilization of WIN services practical.		1 2 3 4 5
43. Identifies and refers for termination enrollees who are satisfactorily employed and are no longer in need of WIN program services.		1 2 3 4 5

CONDUCTS DETERMINATIONS IN CASE OF APPLICANT/ ENROLLEE REFERRED FOR DETERMINATION DECISION.

44. Determines whether enrollee's refusal of employment was with or without good cause.		1 2 3 4 5
45. Determines whether enrollee's refusal of referral to employment was with or without good cause.		1 2 3 4 5
46. Determines whether applicant's refusal to enroll was with or without good cause.		1 2 3 4 5
47. Determines whether enrollee's refusal of assignment in WIN was with or without good cause.		1 2 3 4 5
48. Determines whether enrollee's de facto refusal to participate is with or without good cause.		1 2 3 4 5
49. Notifies enrollee of the Determination decision, the effect it will have on his Welfare grant, and his future status in the WIN program.		1 2 3 4 5
50. Notifies Welfare Department of the Determination decision.		1 2 3 4 5

Go on to Next Page

Listed below are a duty and the tasks which it includes. Please check all tasks which you perform. When you have finished this, go back and rate each task checked for amount of time you spend on it compared to the time spent on each of the other tasks you perform.	✓ if you do	Time Spent 1—much less time 2—slightly less time 3—same amount as on most others 4—slightly greater amount 5—much greater amount
CONDUCTS DETERMINATIONS IN CASE OF APPLICANT/ ENROLLEE REFERRED FOR DETERMINATION DECISION (Continued).		
51. Notifies enrollee whose refusal is considered not valid of his right to appeal and the procedures for appeal.	☐	1 2 3 4 5
52. Represents the Department of Employment at WIN Appeal Hearings.	☐	1 2 3 4 5
PROVIDES EDUCATION AND WORK AND TRAINING COMPONENT RESOURCES TO SERVICE THE JOB-PREPARATION NEEDS OF WIN ENROLLEES.		
53. Analyzes present and projected labor market requirements in light of anticipated job qualification characteristics of WIN enrollees, and extent and kinds of vocational preparation feasible within the framework of the WIN program.	☐	1 2 3 4 5
54. Reviews on a continuing basis, the vocational plans and aspirations of enrollees in the program.	☐	1 2 3 4 5
55. Determines the occupational areas in the local labor market likely to serve as the goals of enrollees' employability plans.	☐	1 2 3 4 5
56. Identifies qualified agencies within the local area competent to provide education or work training component services consistent with the WIN program's objectives.	☐	1 2 3 4 5
57. Develops agreements with qualified agencies to provide education or work training programs.	☐	1 2 3 4 5
58. Monitors operation of education and work and training components to assure that they continue to meet WIN enrollee needs and WIN program standards.	☐	1 2 3 4 5
DEVELOPS AND/OR LOCATES JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR WIN ENROLLEES.		
59. Studies employment practices and problems of local public and private employers to identify areas which might permit development of increased employment opportunities for WIN enrollees.	☐	1 2 3 4 5
60. Interests and assists employers in identifying and modifying irrelevant or unrealistically stringent employment standards.	☐	1 2 3 4 5

Go on to Next Page

Listed below are a duty and the tasks which it includes. Please check all tasks which you perform. When you have finished this, go back and rate each task checked for amount of time you spend on it compared to the time spent on each of the other tasks you perform.	√ If you do	Time Spent 1—much less time 2—slightly less time 3—same amount as on most others 4—slightly greater amount 5—much greater amount

DEVELOPS AND/OR LOCATES JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR WIN ENROLLEES (Continued).

61. Interests and assists employers in restructuring jobs and career advancement opportunities.		1 2 3 4 5
62. Works with or through job development personnel of other agencies to achieve increased employment opportunities for WIN enrollees.		1 2 3 4 5
63. Initiates and maintains contacts with local employers in an effort to locate and identify appropriate jobs for specific WIN enrollees.		1 2 3 4 5
64. Works through the local State Employment Office to locate job opportunities for WIN enrollees nearing completion of their employment preparation or training.		1 2 3 4 5
65. Advises the team regarding the adequacy of training services provided and their relevance to employers' hiring standards and the skills required on the job.		1 2 3 4 5
66. Advises the team regarding the appropriateness of individual enrollees' employability plans in relation to job opportunities and hiring standards.		1 2 3 4 5

PERFORMS INTERNAL TEAM MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS NECESSARY TO COORDINATE AND SUPPORT TEAM MEMBER EFFORTS WITH THE INDIVIDUAL ENROLLEES.

67. Plans and/or supervises the maintenance of an individual case folder record system.		1 2 3 4 5
68. Plans and/or supervises the maintenance of a system to provide Team members with information concerning the current enrollment status of each enrollee.		1 2 3 4 5
69. Calls or arranges scheduling of Team conferences to accomplish employability planning for individual enrollees.		1 2 3 4 5
70. Assigns or distributes enrollee caseload responsibilities to individual Team members.		1 2 3 4 5

Go on to Next Page

Listed below are a duty and the tasks which it includes. Please check all tasks which you perform. When you have finished this, go back and rate each task checked for amount of time you spend on it compared to the time spent on each of the other tasks you perform.

	√ if you do	Time Spent 1—much less time 2—slightly less time 3—same amount as on most others 4—slightly greater amount 5—much greater amount
PERFORMS INTERNAL TEAM MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS NECESSARY TO COORDINATE AND SUPPORT TEAM MEMBER EFFORTS WITH THE INDIVIDUAL ENROLLEES (Continued).		
71. Plans inservice training and workshops for WIN Team members.		1 2 3 4 5
72. Conducts inservice training and workshops for WIN Team members.		1 2 3 4 5
73. Attends inservice training and workshops for WIN Team members.		1 2 3 4 5
74. Reads and reviews WIN directives to keep abreast of program guidance relevant to Team members' duties and functions.		1 2 3 4 5
PERFORMS CLERICAL DUTIES REQUIRED FOR INITIATION AND MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS AND PREPARATION OF REPORTS.		
75. Initiates individual case folder for each new enrollee.		1 2 3 4 5
76. Records progress notes and other relevant information in the individual's enrollee's record folder.		1 2 3 4 5
77. Prepares letter or forms required to authorize the individuals enrollment in WIN components.		1 2 3 4 5
78. Prepares letters or forms required upon termination of an individual's enrollment in the program.		1 2 3 4 5
79. Maintains records showing current enrollment status of each enrollee.		1 2 3 4 5
80. Prepares letters or forms required to notify appropriate agencies of changes in the individual's enrollment status.		1 2 3 4 5

Go on to Next Page

Listed below are a duty and the tasks which it includes. Please check all tasks which you perform. When you have finished this, go back and rate each task checked for amount of time you spend on it compared to the time spent on each of the other tasks you perform.

√ if you do	Time Spent 1—much less time 2—slightly less time 3—same amount as on most others 4—slightly greater amount 5—much greater amount

PERFORMS CLERICAL DUTIES REQUIRED FOR INITIATION AND MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS AND PREPARATION OF REPORTS (Continued).

81. Prepares letters or forms required for enrollee to be authorized to receive WIN incentive payments.		1 2 3 4 5
82. Prepares monthly program activity or other periodic administrative reports.		1 2 3 4 5

NOTE:
Please be sure you have completed the "Time Spent" ratings for each task you perform before turning this page and starting the next series of questions.

Major Caseload Functions (T)

Below is a list of major caseload functions accomplished by WIN staff. We wish to know who is involved in accomplishing each of these caseload functions for the group of enrollees with whom you work.

The names of the members of your group, including your own, are listed on the attached sheet. The number next to each name on the attached list tells you which of the columns below to use for that person when recording your answers. For example, use the column below labeled "#1" for the person whose name is written by the #1 on the attached list; use column #2 for the person whose name appears next to the #2 on the list; and so on.

After reading the description of each function, mark an answer for yourself and each of the other persons listed before going on to the next caseload function.

For yourself and each person listed, circle the:
Y (for yes) if you know the person is directly involved in accomplishing this function;
? (for uncertain) if you are not sure if the person is directly involved;
N (for no) if you know the person *is not* directly involved in accomplishing this function.

PLEASE CIRCLE EITHER THE Y, ?, OR N FOR EACH PERSON ON EACH OF THE CASELOAD FUNCTIONS.

MAJOR CASELOAD FUNCTIONS	WIN Staff Members (See names on attached list)									
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10
1. Receive and schedule referrals for enrollment.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N
2. Enrollment of applicants.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N
3. Assessment and identification of new enrollee's employability status and needs.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N
4. Conduct of WIN Orientation and/or special employability preparation sessions.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N

Go on to Next Page

PLEASE CIRCLE EITHER THE Y, ?, OR N FOR EACH PERSON ON EACH OF THE CASELOAD FUNCTIONS

MAJOR CASELOAD FUNCTIONS	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10
5. Development of formal or informal employability plans.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N
6. Referral of enrollees to appropriate education, training and work experience components.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N
7. Supervision of enrollee's attendance and progress while enrolled in WIN.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N
8. Securing job placement of enrollee at appropriate time.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N
9. Conduct of Determinations.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N
10. Location of facilities to provide needed education, training, and job experience components.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N
11. Location and/or development of job opportunities for current or future enrollees.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N
12. Provision of follow-up services to enrollees who have gained employment.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N
13. Maintenance of a system of records on individual enrollees.	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N	Y ? N

Go on to Next Page

Major Caseload Decision Areas

On this page we wish you to rate how big a part the *client, yourself, and each member of your group* play in influencing decisions made in each of the different decision areas listed below.

The names of the members of your group, including your own, are listed on the attached sheet. The number next to each name on the attached list tells you which of the columns below to use for that person's ratings. For example, use the column below labeled "#1" for the person whose name is listed as #1 on the attached list, use column #2 for the person whose name appears as #2 on the attached list; and, so on. Ratings for the part the client usually plays in the different decisions made are to be entered in the column headed "Client".

After reading the description of a particular decision area, make your ratings by answering the following question:

HOW BIG A PART DOES EACH PERSON BEING RATED USUALLY PLAY IN DETERMINING THE DECISIONS MADE IN THIS DECISION AREA?

1—plays no part in decisions made in this area;
2—plays minor part;
3—plays moderate part;
4—plays major part;
5—makes decisions in this area by himself.

Mark your answers by recording in each persons column the number from the rating scale which best describes the part that person usually plays in making decisions of that type.

MAJOR CASELOAD DECISION AREAS	Client	WIN Staff Members (See names on attached list)									
		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10
1. Identification of those who can be considered appropriate for enrollment and those who cannot.											
2. Identification of new enrollee as either job ready or as in need of further employability preparation.											
3. Identification of initial component to which new enrollee will be assigned.											
4. Identification of feasible employment goals for the individual enrollee.											

Go on to Next Page

Mark your answers by recording in each person's column the number from the rating scale which best describes the part that person usually plays in making decisions of that type.

MAJOR CASELOAD DECISION AREAS	Client	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10
5. Identification of education, training and work experience components needed to enable the individual enrollee to attain his employment goals.											
6. Identification of when modifications or revisions in enrollee employability plans are required.											
7. Identification of the specific modifications or revisions of employability plans required for individual enrollee.											
8. Identification of the nature of follow-up services required by the individual enrollee.											
9. Identification of when it is appropriate to refer enrollee for termination.											

OE 008 240